

of Indiana, favoring passage of a service-pension law—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DALZELL: Paper to accompany bill for the relief of the Phoenix Brewing Company, of Pittsburg, and Ober Brothers Brewing Company, of Allegheny, Pa.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DRAPER: Resolution of A. M. Cook Post, No. 326, Grand Army of the Republic, of Greenwich, Department of New York, favoring passage of a service-pension law—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Resolution of the Association of Commissioners of the Levee Drainage Districts, relative to the improvement of the upper Mississippi River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, resolution of the Grain Dealers' National Convention, favoring enlargement of powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of San Miguel Improvement Club, favoring Nacimiento ranch as a military camp—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, paper to accompany bill granting increase of pension to Ira Bacon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARDNER of Michigan: Petition of citizens of Grand Ledge, Mich., to accompany bill to correct the military record of Cyrus Dean—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: Papers to accompany bill for the relief of James P. Barney—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, resolutions of the Chamber of Commerce and other organizations of Cincinnati, Ohio, protesting against passage of Senate bill 1655, creating a new Federal district court in Ohio—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUDGER: Paper to accompany bill to pension Moses F. Reese—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HINSHAW: Paper to accompany bill H. R. 1482, granting an increase of pension to George C. Vance—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOWELL of New Jersey: Paper to accompany bill granting an increase of pension to James Payton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KETCHAM: Resolution of the board of supervisors of Columbia County, N. Y., favoring the passage of the Brownlow bill relating to the improvement of the highways—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MCANDREWS: Paper to accompany bill H. R. 6932, to pension Harvey R. King—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MACON: Paper to accompany bill increasing pension of John S. Parker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MARSH: Petition of residents of Keithsburg and vicinity, Illinois, relative to the improvement of the upper Mississippi River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. MORRELL: Petition of the president of the Society of the United States Military Telegraph Corps, requesting recognition for the telegraph operators of the civil war—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MURDOCK: Resolution of a mass meeting of citizens of Wichita, Kans., favoring the enlargement of the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolution of Woodson Post, No. 185, Grand Army of the Republic, Yates Center, Department of Kansas, favoring passage of a service-pension law—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, letter from H. C. Taylor, of Lyons, Kans., protesting against certain features of Senate bill 1261; letter from A. Graff, Wellington, Kans., and resolutions of the executive committee of the Southwestern Lumbermen's Association—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. OTJEN: Resolution of the Glass Bottle Blowers' Association, Branch 15, of Milwaukee, Wis., favoring passage of an eight-hour law and an anti-injunction bill—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. PADGETT: Paper to accompany bill H. R. 1098, for the relief of J. J. Walker—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PORTER: Resolution of the Association of Commissioners of the Levee Drainage Districts, relative to the improvement of the upper Mississippi River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. ROBB: Petition of citizens of Puxico, Mo., against sale of liquors in Soldiers' Homes and all Government buildings—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. RUSSELL: Petition of Dames of 1846, of Fort Worth, Tex., praying for increase of pension to veterans of the Mexican war—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SIMS: Petition of the heirs of John Arnold, deceased, praying reference of war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH: Papers to accompany bill granting a pension to Rose Anna Griffith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, resolutions of Grand Rapids Board of Trade, requesting enlargement of powers of Interstate Commerce Commission—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolutions of Grand Rapids Board of Trade, regarding rehabilitation of the merchant marine—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of citizens of Ionia County, Mich., requesting the passage of the McCumber bill—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. SPARKMAN: Resolution of the Chamber of Commerce of Pensacola, Fla., urging the revival of American shipping in foreign trade—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SPERRY: Paper to accompany bill H. R. 7815, for the relief of Robert May et al.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: Petition of the Dames of 1846, of Fort Worth, Tex., favoring passage of law granting increase of all Mexican-war veterans to \$30 per month—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, December 17, 1903.

Prayer by Rev. F. J. PRETTYMAN, of the city of Washington.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. PENROSE, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Journal will stand approved.

KIRBY THOMAS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Postmaster-General, relative to the claim of Kirby Thomas, postmaster at Superior, Wis., and recommending that he be reimbursed for the loss sustained by him from the burglary of his office on October 20, 1903; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

DISPOSITION OF USELESS PAPERS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the chief of the supply division, War Department, stating the proceeds derived from the sale of useless papers, etc.; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Select Committee on Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments.

FINDINGS OF THE COURT OF CLAIMS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate communications from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting certified copies of the findings of fact filed by the court in the causes of Clementine Vaughn, administratrix of William Vaughn, deceased; Francis E. Mack, son of Eugene Mack, deceased; Nannie H. Duvall, daughter of John Watters, deceased; William I. More; John F. Merry; William Wilkins Carr, administrator of the estate of Overton Carr, deceased; Sophia A. Wight, widow of Danforth P. Wight, deceased; Susan I. Bordman, widow of Charles Bordman, deceased; Fidelia S. Prindle, widow (remarried) of George L. Mead, deceased; Annie H. Eastman, widow of Thomas H. Eastman, deceased; William F. Low; George L. Hall, executor of Elbridge D. Hall, deceased; Grace T. Arms, executrix; T. Bascom Watkins; Hamilton Hutchins; Charles Miller; Arthur Burtis; J. M. Emanuel; Henry R. Baker; Robert M. Doyle; George P. Lumsden; Charles A. Schmitz; Byron Wilson; Cornelius Dugan; George M. Book; J. M. Bowyer; George A. Norris; Clifford J. Boush; Elizabeth D. Marthon, executrix of Joseph Marthon, deceased; William H. Rush; Emily J. Kenney, administratrix of Edward Kenney, deceased; Henry T. Percy; Robert Potts; George R. Durand; N. E. Mason; Frank C. Cosby; William F. Hodgkinson; E. Whitfield, brother of William E. Whitfield, deceased; Kate R. Morgan, widow of William A. Morgan; James D. Adams; William A. Cooper; Linnaeus Fussell; Peter O'Conner; Mary Lowrie, heir and legatee of John Lowrie; Marie Elizabeth Horner, widow of Frederick Horner, deceased; Marion L. Thompson, widow of August F. Thompson, deceased; Charles W. Abbott, administrator de bonis non of Joel Abbott, deceased; Arthur B. Hoff, administrator of Henry K. Hoff, deceased; Nannie Glover Kaufman, widow (remarried) of William K. Mayo, deceased; John J. Read; Hannah Cooper, widow of James M. Cooper, deceased; Emma L. Barry, widow of James J. Barry; Adele W. Elmer, widow of Horace Elmer; Evaline V. Ferguson, widow of William J. Ferguson, deceased; the Real Estate Title Insurance and Trust Company of Philadelphia, administrator of the estate of Charles Miller, deceased; Sarah A. Wyckoff,

widow of John Wyckof, deceased; Susan and Mary P. Woodman, executrices of Edward Woodman, deceased; Harvey E. Macconn, widow of Robert T. Macconn, deceased; John E. Roller; Francis M. Gunnell; David B. Harmony; Philip J. Miller, son of Philip J. Miller, deceased; Josephine Q. Carpenter and Anna L. Q. Hayes, daughters of John M. Quackenbush, deceased; Frank A. Burbeck, administrator of Isaac Brinckerhoff, deceased; George M. Engle, son of Frederick Engle, deceased; Francis E. Hunt and Alice M. Hunt, heirs at law of George P. Hunt, deceased; Emma M. Clark, administratrix, and Wallace S. Clark, administrator of Ambrose J. Clark, deceased; John A. B. Smith; David M. Fulmer; Walter McLean; Herbert M. Griffiths; Charles A. Davis, son and next of kin of George L. Davis, deceased; John Gaskins; Robert L. Meade, son of Richard W. Meade, deceased; Edward Shippen; Safe Deposit and Trust Company of Baltimore, executor of Edward Donaldson, deceased; Robert A. Williams; Anna L. Coghlan, executrix of the estate of Jasper Coghlan, deceased; Aaron K. Hughes; Mary E. Braine, widow of Daniel L. Braine, deceased; Alexander W. Cassell; Nicholas Mager, jr., executor of the estate of Nicholas Mager, deceased; Eleanor Sirian, widow of George Sirian, deceased; Charles Martin; Thomas S. Phelps; Edward Kershner; Mary A. McCarty, widow of Stephen A. McCarty, deceased; Florence Hayward, daughter of George W. Hayward, deceased; Isabella Jaureche, Rose Jaureche, and Blanche V. Jaureche, heirs at law of L. C. Sartori, deceased; Edward H. Gheen; Cromwell G. Macy, nephew of Thomas M. Gardner; Mae H. Tyler, widow of Hanson R. Tyler, deceased; J. P. Andre Mottu, administrator of John C. Burnett, deceased; Phoebe A. Hardy, sister of De Witt Clinton Kells, deceased; P. J. Horwitz; Francis H. Delano; A. N. Stocker, widow of Henry T. Stocker, deceased; Charles U. Gravatt; Alice E. Whitmarsh, daughter of Zachariah C. Whitmarsh, deceased; M. Annette Upham, administratrix of Charles C. Upham, deceased; Webster Doty; J. B. Murdock; Nelson M. Ferebee; Mary H. Woodward, widow of Edwin T. Woodward, deceased; Fidelity Trust Company, administrator of Francis G. Dallas, deceased; Nelson T. Houston; Winslow Allderdice; Francis H. Swan; W. W. Low, son of W. W. Low, deceased; Theodore M. Etting; Henry C. Keene; Walter K. Scofield; William Little; George T. Douglass; Edward M. Wood, administrator of John De Camp, deceased; Annie E. Deering, widow of George A. Deering; David O. Lewis; Kate W. Ingraham, daughter of Samuel Larkin, deceased; John H. Rowland, and Albert I. Smith, administrator of Samuel L. Wilson v. The United States; which, with the accompanying papers, were referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 66) in relation to commuting rations for midshipmen.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bill and joint resolution; and they were thereupon signed by the President pro tempore:

A bill (H. R. 1921) to carry into effect a convention between the United States and the Republic of Cuba, signed on the 11th day of December, in the year 1902; and

A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 66) in relation to commuting rations for midshipmen.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore presented memorials of Marbach Lodge, No. 125, of Bracken; of Waller Lodge, No. 129, of Waller; of Lodge No. 33, of Fort Worth; of Henschkel Lodge, No. 70, of New Ulm; of Frohsinn Lodge, No. 50, of Fayetteville; of Texas Lodge, No. 44, of Columbus; of Lodge No. 61, of Rockdale, all in the State of Texas; of Maumee Lodge, No. 12, of Maumee, Ohio; of Brewery Workers' Local Union, No. 73, American Federation of Labor, of Birmingham; of the German Turn Verein, of Birmingham; of the Quartette Club, of Pullman, all in the State of Alabama; of Wausau Schiechen Verein, of Wausau; of the Appleton Maennerchor, of Appleton; of the Gesangverein Frohsinn, of Broadhead; of the Turn Verein, of Mayville, all in the State of Wisconsin; of the Kreuznaeher Saengerbund, the Quartette Club, the Delaware Bund, No. 30, and the Drill Corp Turnier, No. 8, all of Philadelphia, in the State of Pennsylvania, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to regulate the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of the Woman's Club of Freeport, Ill.; of the Century Club, of Chillicothe, Ohio; of the Ladies' Aid Society of Newberry; of the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Williamsport; of the Epworth League of Williamsport; of the Woman's Christian Endeavor Society of New-

berry, and of the congregation of the Presbyterian Church of Newberry, all in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. PENROSE presented petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Dicksonburg; of sundry citizens of Clearfield, Washington, Easton, and Sheridan; of the congregation of the Baptist Church of Corry; of the congregation of the First Baptist Church of Kittanning; of the congregation of the Oxford Presbyterian Church, of Philadelphia; of the Woman's Missionary Society of Florence; of the Oxford Sabbath School, of Philadelphia; of the Oxford Young People's Society of Christian Endeavor, of Philadelphia; of the congregation of the United Episcopal Church of Myerstown; of the congregation of the Zion Lutheran Church, of Lebanon; of the Christian Endeavor Society of Lebanon; of the congregation of the First Reformed Church of Lebanon; of the congregation of the Moravian Church of Lebanon; of the Christian Endeavor Society of the Zion Lutheran Church, of Lebanon; of the Tabor Reformed Christian Church Endeavor Society, of Lebanon; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Washington County; of the congregation of the Presbyterian Church of Washington; of the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Coatesville; of the Trinity Lutheran Sunday School of New Holland; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Greenfield; of the Woman's Foreign Missionary Society of Coatesville, and of the congregation of the Presbyterian Church of Brownsville, all in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. PLATT of New York presented petitions of Philip H. Sherman Post, No. 630, of Waterford; of Bingham Post, No. 74, of Naples; of John B. Burrud Post, No. 444, of Marion; of Hiram Clark Post, No. 154, of Marathon; of Otis H. Tillinghast Post, No. 548, of Morrisville, all of the Department of New York, Grand Army of the Republic, in the State of New York, and of the National Encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic, of San Francisco, Cal., praying for the enactment of a service-pension law; which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented petitions of the congregation of the Floral Avenue Presbyterian Church, of Binghamton; of the congregation of the Oakland Avenue Presbyterian Church, of Troy, and of sundry citizens of Onondaga County, all in the State of New York, praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. DRYDEN presented petitions of the Porch Club, of River-ton; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Vineland; of the congregation of the First Methodist Episcopal Church of Vineland; of the congregation of the Central Avenue African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church, of Red Bank; of the Woman's Home Missionary Society of the Baptist Church of Haddonfield; of the congregation of the First Presbyterian Church of Vineland; of sundry citizens of Red Bank and Riverton, all in the State of New Jersey, and of David Henry Wright, of Philadelphia, Pa., praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. CULBERSON presented a petition of the Commercial Club, of Dallas, Tex., praying for the enactment of legislation to enlarge the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. DEPEW presented petitions of the congregation of the Free Methodist Episcopal Church of Kendall; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Warrensburg; of the Presbyterian Missionary Society of Cuba; of the congregation of the Hamilton Grange Reformed Church, of New York City; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Kenmore; of the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Davenport Center; of the Presbyterian Epworth League, of Hulburton; of sundry citizens of Troy; of the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church of New York City; of the Woman's Missionary Society of Edinburgh; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Cambridge; of sundry citizens of New York Mills; of the congregation of the Congregational Church of Binghamton; of the Young People's Society of Christian Endeavor of the First Presbyterian Church of Saratoga Springs; of the Ladies' Reading Club, of Wilson; of the Epworth League of Warrensburg; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Kingston; of the congregation of the Third Presbyterian Church of Rochester; of the Ladies' Aid and Home Missionary Society of Warwick; of sundry citizens of Geneseo, Saratoga Springs, and New York City; of the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Rockland, and of the congregation of the Presbyterian Church of Brookhaven, all in the State of New York, praying for an investigation of the charges made

and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. FOSTER of Washington presented a petition of the Christian Endeavor Union of Seattle, Wash., praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. QUARLES presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Milwaukee, Wis., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide a fractional paper currency; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a petition of Manufacturers and Jobbers' Union of La Crosse, Wis., and a petition of the Grain Dealers' National Association, of Chicago, Ill., praying for the enactment of legislation to further define the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission; which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Wisconsin State Federation of Labor and Glass Bottle Blowers' Local Branch No. 15, of Milwaukee, Wis., praying for the passage of the so-called eight-hour bill; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a petition of the Wisconsin State Federation of Labor and Glass Bottle Blowers' Local Branch No. 15, of Milwaukee, Wis., praying for the passage of the so-called anti-injunction bill; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. MCCOMAS presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Baltimore, Md., praying that an appropriation be made for deepening the main ship channel to the port of Baltimore; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. DILLINGHAM presented petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance unions of Chester, Newport, Wilmington, Montpelier, Newbury, Canaan, Holden, and Plainfield; of the congregations of the Congregational churches of Wilmington, Chester, and Wardsboro; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of East Hardwick; of the congregation of the Grace Methodist Episcopal Church, St. Johnsbury; of the Methodist churches of Wilmington, Canaan, and Wardsboro; of the Baptist churches of Middlebury and Wilmington; of the Ladies' Missionary Society of Chester; of the Woman's Home Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Middlebury; of sundry citizens of Wardsboro, Newport, Irasburg, Holden, Chittenden, Brandon, Pittsford, Greensboro Bend, Barnet, and Sheffield, all in the State of Vermont, praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. KEAN presented petitions of the Young People's Society of Christian Endeavor of the Presbyterian Church of Clayton, of sundry citizens of Riverton and Princeton, of the Woman's Home and Foreign Missionary Society of the Presbyterian Church of Clayton, and of the Woman's Home and Foreign Missionary Society of the Presbyterian Church of Passaic, all in the State of New Jersey, praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. SPOONER presented a petition of sundry citizens of Elk Mound, Wis., praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. McLAURIN presented a petition of the descendants of the Mississippi Choctaw tribe of Indians, praying that they be granted their distributive share in lands and money adjudged to be due under the latest treaty with the Five Civilized Tribes; which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. GALLINGER presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Greenville, N. H., praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. DOLLIVER presented memorials of sundry citizens of Spencer and Stacyville, in the State of Iowa, remonstrating against the ratification of the Isle of Pines treaty; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of the Woman's Home Missionary Society of Sioux City, of sundry citizens of Fort Dodge, of the Epworth League of Terril, of the congregation of the Congregational Church of Washington, of the congregations of the Methodist Episcopal and Presbyterian churches of Bloomfield, and of the congregation of the First Congregational Church of Terril, all in the State of Iowa, praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. BURROWS presented petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Hanover, of sundry citizens of Albion, of the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Hanover, and of the Ministerial Alliance of Kalamazoo, all in the State of Michigan, praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. CULLOM presented a petition of sundry citizens of Illinois, praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. ELKINS presented petitions of sundry citizens of Buckhannon, of sundry citizens of Mannington, of the Woman's Missionary Society of Fairmont, and of the Home and Foreign Missionary Society of Mannington, all in the State of West Virginia, praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. ALGER presented a petition of the Ladies of the Maccabees of Hanover, Mich., and a petition of sundry citizens of Cheboygan County, Mich., praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

CONSULAR CERTIFICATION OF IMMIGRANTS.

Mr. LODGE. I present a letter from the Second Assistant Secretary of State, transmitting certain papers relative to consular certification of immigrants. I move that the letter and accompanying papers be printed as a document, and referred to the Committee on Immigration.

The motion was agreed to.

REPORT ON DISEASES.

Mr. MORGAN. I present a document to the Senate, published by the Board of Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service, relating to diseases in many countries, and particularly in the tropical countries of America. I move that it be printed as a document, and referred to the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine.

The motion was agreed to.

GRAZING ON FOREST RESERVES.

Mr. DUBOIS. I present a resolution of the Wool Growers' Association of Idaho, and ask that it be printed in the RECORD. It treats of the relations between the stock growers of the West and the forest reserves, is very short, temperate, and pertinent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Idaho asks that the paper sent to the desk by him may be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. ALDRICH. Let it be read.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. And then it will go into the RECORD.

Mr. ALDRICH. I should like to have it read.

Mr. DUBOIS. I will ask the Chair to send me the resolution, and then I will take the privilege of reading it.

Mr. ALDRICH. I do not see any reason why that should be done. The Secretary can read it.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. Let it be read at the desk.

Mr. DUBOIS. I beg the Senator's pardon. I thought he objected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair hears no objection to the resolution being printed in the RECORD. Does the Senator from Rhode Island ask that it be read?

Mr. ALDRICH. I do.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It will be read.

The memorial was read, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as follows:

Whereas the members of the Idaho Wool Growers' Association in annual convention assembled are not opposed to the protection of the forests when such protection is afforded strictly to lands covered with timber, they are, however, opposed to the present policy of the Government in setting aside alleged forest reserves in which are included large tracts of grazing and agricultural lands from which in many instances stockmen are excluded from grazing; and

Whereas the argument advanced that the grazing of live stock on forest reserves is injurious to the growth of timber has been proven a fallacy for the reason that the grazing of stock on reserves removes all grass and weeds and thereby prevents fires, which are the greatest destroyers of forests: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That this association protests against the present policy of the Government in handling forest reserves, and that we favor the restriction of reserves and such lands as are actual forest land, and that such reserves be confined to the natural watersheds; and, be it further

Resolved, That the forest reserves of the United States shall be placed under the direction and control of the Secretary of the Department of Agriculture; and, be it further

Resolved, That this association heartily indorse the recommendation of President Roosevelt in his last message to Congress, and of the Commissioner of the General Land Office, W. A. Richards, upon this subject.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. COCKRELL, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 59) for the relief of Charles W. Howard;

A bill (S. 56) for the relief of the legal representatives of Napoleon B. Giddings;

A bill (S. 61) for the relief of M. E. Saville;

A bill (S. 54) for the relief of William B. Parnes;

A bill (S. 57) for the relief of Laura S. Gillingwaters;

A bill (S. 58) for the relief of James W. Howell;

A bill (S. 62) for the relief of Richard C. Silence;

A bill (S. 63) for the relief of Charles Stierlin;

A bill (S. 60) for the relief of Gottlieb C. Rose; and

A bill (S. 64) to correct the military record of William B. Thompson.

Mr. LODGE, from the Committee on the Philippines, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2259) to regulate shipping in trade between ports of the United States and ports or places in the Philippine Archipelago, between ports or places in the Philippine Archipelago, and for other purposes, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1482) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Treasury to pay James L. Anderson the sum of \$798.28, asked to be discharged from its further consideration and that it be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs; which was agreed to.

Mr. FORAKER, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2081) to provide for the appropriate marking of the graves of the soldiers and sailors of the Confederate army and navy, and for other purposes, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. BLACKBURN. I am directed by the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 126) for the relief of Rudolf Herbst, to report it without amendment, the committee adopting the report made upon the same bill at the last Congress.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be placed on the Calendar.

Mr. DUBOIS, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2686) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the adjudication and payment of claims arising from Indian depredations," approved March 3, 1891, asked to be discharged from its further consideration and that it be referred to the Committee on Indian Depredations; which was agreed to.

Mr. BERRY, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2300) to supplement and amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Grays Point, Mo.," approved January 26, 1901, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. STEWART, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1741) for the relief of the county of White Pine, State of Nevada, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. McCUMBER, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 197) to establish an Indian agricultural school at or near the city of Wahpeton, in the State of North Dakota, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. WETMORE, from the Committee on the Library, to whom were referred the following joint resolutions, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A joint resolution (S. R. 21) authorizing the purchase of a marble bust of General Lafayette, executed by David D'Angers; and

A joint resolution (S. R. 20) authorizing the selection of a site and the erection of a pedestal for a bronze statue in Washington, D. C., in honor of the late Henry Wadsworth Longfellow.

Mr. QUARLES, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 540) providing for additional officers in the district of Chicago, in the collection district of Indiana and Illinois, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. MALLORY, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2262) to provide for the removal or destruction of derelicts, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. PROCTOR, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 746) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Charles K. Bolster, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom the subject was referred, submitted a report, accompanied by a bill (S. 2697) to amend an act authorizing the Secretary of War to cause to be erected monuments and markers on the battlefield of Gettysburg,

Pa., to commemorate the valorous deeds of certain regiments and batteries of the United States Army; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. WARREN, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2114) to fix the rank of certain officers in the Army, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 146) for the relief of Leonard L. Dietrick, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. MITCHELL, from the Committee on Pacific Islands and Porto Rico, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2400) to approve act No. 31 of the session of 1903 of the legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, approved April 22, 1903, entitled "An act providing for the organization and government of counties and districts, and the management and control of public works and public institutions therein," reported it with amendments.

Mr. PERKINS, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2692) to establish a life-saving station at Cape Nome, Alaska, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2225) to provide a depot for the Revenue-Cutter Service, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 180) to provide an American register for the barkentine *Hawaii*, reported adversely thereon; and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

Mr. BATE, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 619) making an appropriation for completing the construction of the road to the national cemetery near Pensacola, Fla., reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. BLACKBURN, from the Committee on Pacific Islands and Porto Rico, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2401) to approve a special act duly enacted by the legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize and provide for the manufacture, distribution, and supply of electric light and power on the island of Oahu, Territory of Hawaii, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also (for Mr. HAWLEY), from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 970) to authorize the President to revoke the order dismissing William T. Godwin, late first lieutenant, Tenth Infantry, United States Army, and to place the said William T. Godwin on the retired list with the rank of first lieutenant, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

EMPLOYMENT OF STENOGRAPHER.

Mr. KEAN, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to whom was referred the resolution submitted yesterday by Mr. FORAKER, reported it without amendment; and it was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate, That the Committee on Pacific Islands and Porto Rico be authorized to employ a stenographer, from time to time, as may be necessary, to report such testimony as may be taken by said committee and its subcommittees in connection with subjects considered or to be considered during the Fifty-eighth Congress, such stenographer to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate.

EXHIBITORS AT LOUISIANA PURCHASE EXPOSITION.

Mr. McCOMAS. I am instructed by the Committee on Patents, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2022) to afford protection to exhibitors of foreign literary, artistic, or musical works at the Louisiana Purchase Exposition, to report it favorably with an amendment striking out one word. The bill is a unanimous report from the committee, and I ask for its present consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be read.

Mr. McCOMAS. Would it be in order to state the substance without reading?

Mr. BERRY. Oh, no; let it be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It will be read.

The Secretary read the bill.

Mr. COCKRELL. I hope unanimous consent will be given for the consideration of the bill. It has been approved by the Committee on Patents of both the Senate and House, and was prepared by the Librarian of Congress. It affects only foreign publications. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] introduced a similar bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GORMAN. There will not be any objection if the bill is to pass through without debate in the morning hour. I have no objection to the bill, but if it elicits debate I shall feel constrained to object.

The Senate, by unanimous consent, proceeded to consider the bill.

The amendment of the Committee on Patents was, in section 1, page 1, line 14, to strike out the word "and" before the word "upon;" so as to make the section read:

That the author of any book, map, chart, dramatic composition, musical composition, engraving, cut, print, chromo, lithograph, or photograph published abroad prior to November 30, 1904, but not registered for copyright protection in the United States copyright office, or the heirs and assigns of such author, shall have in the case of any such book, map, chart, dramatic composition, musical composition, engraving, cut, print, chromo, lithograph, or photograph intended for exhibition at the Louisiana Purchase Exposition the sole liberty of printing, reprinting, publishing, copying, and vending the same within the limits of the United States for the term herein provided for upon complying with the provisions of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. MITCHELL introduced a bill (S. 2698) to establish a life-saving station at or near the entrance to Tillamook Bay, Oregon; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2699) for the relief of William H. Crook; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. McENERY introduced a bill (S. 2700) granting an increase of pension to Fannie C. Morey; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 2701) for the relief of the heirs of Bosman Lyons, deceased;

A bill (S. 2702) for the relief of the estates of Joseph Devezin Olivier and Celeste Olivier, deceased;

A bill (S. 2703) for the relief of the heirs of Henry Ware; and

A bill (S. 2704) for the relief of Mrs. Kate T. McCulloch, the estate of Mrs. Mary Tucker McFarland, deceased, and the estate of Nathan Trotter, deceased.

Mr. GIBSON introduced a bill (S. 2705) for the relief of the wandering American-born Indians of Rockyboy's band, Montana; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also (for Mr. CLARK of Montana) introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 2706) granting an increase of pension to David Noble;

A bill (S. 2707) granting an increase of pension to James M. Clemens; and

A bill (S. 2708) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Cupples.

Mr. PROCTOR introduced a bill (S. 2709) granting an increase of pension to John H. Evans; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. GALLINGER introduced a bill (S. 2710) for the opening of connecting highways on the east and west sides of the Zoological Park, District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2711) granting an increase of pension to Fannie S. Moore; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. FAIRBANKS introduced a bill (S. 2712) granting an increase of pension to Harriet Billings; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2713) granting an increase of pension to Robert Firth; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. DEPEW introduced a bill (S. 2714) to amend section 839 of the Revised Statutes; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. SPOONER introduced a bill (S. 2715) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Patrick; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. MCCOMAS introduced a bill (S. 2716) authorizing the President of the United States to nominate Joseph C. Byron, late a captain and assistant quartermaster, to be a captain and assistant quartermaster on the retired list; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 2717) granting an increase of pension to Alfred G. Lewis;

A bill (S. 2718) granting an increase of pension to Robert Stone-sifer;

A bill (S. 2719) granting an increase of pension to Della J. Ruth-erford; and

A bill (S. 2720) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth S. Gannon.

Mr. CARMACK introduced a bill (S. 2721) for the relief of the heirs of Hardin P. Franklin, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. HEYBURN introduced a bill (S. 2722) limiting the right of selection of public lands of the United States in lieu of surrendered railroad land-grant lands; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. McLAURIN introduced a bill (S. 2723) for the relief of the heirs of Mrs. C. M. J. Williamson; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. DRYDEN introduced a bill (S. 2724) for the relief of Clotilda Freund, assignee of Frank W. Freund; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. QUARLES introduced a bill (S. 2725) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Waukesha, in the State of Wisconsin; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2726) granting an increase of pension to Rosa Olds Jenkins; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2727) granting an increase of pension to Alice M. Stafford; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also (by request) introduced a bill (S. 2728) to protect the right of women citizens of the United States to register and vote for Members of the House of Representatives; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Select Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Mr. HOPKINS introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 2729) granting an increase of pension to George Warner;

A bill (S. 2730) granting an increase of pension to Jasper N. Jennings; and

A bill (S. 2731) granting an increase of pension to John R. McCullough.

Mr. HOPKINS introduced a bill (S. 2732) for the relief of occupants and owners of property at Camp Tyler, in Cook County, Ill.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. BURROWS introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 2733) to provide for the payment of an attorney fee from accrued pensions in certain cases;

A bill (S. 2734) granting an increase of pension to Marion F. White; and

A bill (S. 2735) granting an increase of pension to Jasper H. Keys.

Mr. SIMMONS introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 2736) for the relief of the heirs of Nancy Burfield, deceased;

A bill (S. 2737) for the relief of K. H. Lewis and W. F. Lewis;

A bill (S. 2738) for the relief of John L. Brown, and the estates of A. T. Redditt and William G. Judkins;

A bill (S. 2739) for the relief of the widow and heirs at law of Charles Wilkes, deceased, late a rear-admiral in the United States Navy;

A bill (S. 2740) for the relief of the estate of Thomas A. Dough, deceased;

A bill (S. 2741) for the relief of Walter T. Dough; and

A bill (S. 2742) for the relief of the estate of Esau Berry, deceased.

Mr. PENROSE introduced a bill (S. 2743) for the relief of Thomas H. Carpenter; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2744) for the relief of Mary V. Shaw; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2745) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Howard; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2746) granting a pension to Joseph

N. Lorio; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2747) to amend the act of September 19, 1890, entitled "An act to amend certain sections of the Revised Statutes, relating to lotteries, and for other purposes;" which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. FOSTER of Washington introduced a bill (S. 2748) for the relief of A. W. Curtis; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2749) for the relief of Henry Bash; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2750) granting an increase of pension to Fidelia A. Boyd; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. ELKINS introduced a bill (S. 2751) for the relief of Leroy Douglass; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2752) referring to the Court of Claims the claim of the legal heirs of John Harper, deceased, to certain lands in the State of Virginia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2753) to remove charge of desertion from John Lyons; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 2754) granting a pension to I. W. Allen;

A bill (S. 2755) granting a pension to Eliza Lewis; and

A bill (S. 2756) granting a pension to Henry King.

Mr. CULLOM introduced a bill (S. 2757) to correct the military record of Stephen W. Coakley; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. MARTIN introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 2758) for the relief of R. H. Hayden and Emma Hayden, executrix of the estate of Logan F. Hayden, deceased (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 2759) for the relief of Mount Oliver Protestant Methodist Church, of Alexandria County, Va.;

A bill (S. 2760) for the relief of the trustees of Chestnut Fork Old School Baptist Church, of Culpeper County, Va.;

A bill (S. 2761) for the relief of the vestry of St. Stephen's Protestant Episcopal Church, of Culpeper, Va.;

A bill (S. 2762) for the relief of the vestry of St. Paul's Episcopal Church, of Culpeper County, Va.;

A bill (S. 2763) for the relief of the trustees of Berea Baptist Church, of Stafford County, Va.;

A bill (S. 2764) for the relief of Andrews Chapel, of Stafford County, Va.;

A bill (S. 2765) for the relief of the trustees of Methodist Episcopal Church South, at Sudley, Prince William County, Va.;

A bill (S. 2766) for the relief of the trustees of Black Lick Church, in Fairfax County, Va.;

A bill (S. 2767) for the relief of the Culpeper Baptist Church, at Culpeper, Va.;

A bill (S. 2768) for the relief of the trustees of Calvary Protestant Episcopal Church;

A bill (S. 2769) for the relief of the trustees of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, of the town of Culpeper, Va.;

A bill (S. 2770) for the relief of the vestry of St. Mark's Episcopal Church, Fairfax County, Va.;

A bill (S. 2771) for the relief of the vestry of Aquia Protestant Episcopal Church, of Stafford County, Va.;

A bill (S. 2772) for the relief of the trustees of Hartwood Presbyterian Church, of Stafford County, Va.;

A bill (S. 2773) for the relief of the trustees of the Waterford Baptist Church, Waterford, Loudoun County, Va.;

A bill (S. 2774) for the relief of the trustees of Union Church, of Falmouth, Stafford County, Va.;

A bill (S. 2775) for the relief of the trustees of Broad Run Baptist Church;

A bill (S. 2776) for the relief of the trustees of Mount Horeb Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Fauquier County, Va.;

A bill (S. 2777) for the relief of the vestry of the Episcopal Church of Remington, Fauquier County, Va.;

A bill (S. 2778) for the relief of the trustees of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Marshall, Va.;

A bill (S. 2779) for the relief of the trustees of Zoar Baptist Church, of Bristersburg, Fauquier County, Va.;

A bill (S. 2780) for the relief of the Presbyterian Church at Warrenton, Va.;

A bill (S. 2781) for the relief of the vestry of Lambs Creek Protestant Episcopal Church;

A bill (S. 2782) for the relief of the trustees of Round Hill Church, of King George County, Va.;

A bill (S. 2783) for the relief of Pohick Church, in Fairfax County, Va.;

A bill (S. 2784) for relief of the vestry of St. Paul's Episcopal Church, of Alexandria, Va.;

A bill (S. 2785) for the relief of Miss L. E. Bowen;

A bill (S. 2786) for the relief of Joseph E. Funkhouser (with an accompanying paper); and

A bill (S. 2787) for the relief of the estate of John B. Brown, deceased (with an accompanying paper).

Mr. BACON introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 2788) to execute the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Clementine Vaughan, administratrix of William M. Vaughan, deceased;

A bill (S. 2789) for the relief of James A. Kennedy; and

A bill (S. 2790) for the relief of Isabella R. Napier.

AMENDMENTS TO BILLS.

Mr. STEWART submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 275) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the adjudication and payment of claims arising from Indian depredations," approved March 3, 1901; which was referred to the Committee on Indian Depredations, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. WARREN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 17) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide revenue for the Government and to encourage the industries of the United States," approved July 24, 1897; which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. PERKINS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 5) to refer to the Court of Claims the war claims of the State of New Hampshire; which was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

NATIONAL FOREST RESERVE IN WHITE MOUNTAINS.

Mr. GALLINGER. I ask for a reprint of the bill (S. 2327) for the purchase of a national forest reserve in the White Mountains, to be known as the "National White Mountain Forest Reserve." The call for copies of this bill is coming in to an extent that will require a reprint of it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair hears no objection to the request of the Senator, and the order is made.

REMOVAL OR DESTRUCTION OF DERELICTS.

On motion of Mr. MALLORY, it was

Ordered, That 500 additional copies of the bill (S. 2262) to provide for the removal or destruction of derelicts, and accompanying report, be printed as one document for the use of the Senate.

PENOBSCOT RIVER IMPROVEMENT IN MAINE.

Mr. HALE submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to cause a survey to be made of the South Branch of the Penobscot River near Frankfort, Me., with a view to widening and deepening the channel, and to submit a plan and estimate for such improvement.

RENTAL OF BUILDINGS.

Mr. ELKINS. I submit a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of War, the Attorney-General, the Postmaster-General, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Civil Service Commission, the Public Printer, and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are hereby directed to transmit to the Senate at the earliest practicable day a statement of the quarters and buildings rented by each of said Departments and Commissions in the District of Columbia and the various States and Territories, and the annual rental in each case.

The Senate, by unanimous consent, proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I should like to have the resolution read once more. It seems to me, as I caught it, that it requires each Secretary to make a report as to all buildings rented.

Mr. ELKINS. In each Department.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. If it applies to each Department it is all right.

Mr. ELKINS. Each Secretary, etc., is to report on the rent of buildings in his Department.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. "Quarters and buildings rented by each" is the language.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. That is right.

The resolution was agreed to.

REPORT ON RECLAMATION SERVICE.

Mr. BARD submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed 5,000 copies of the First Annual Report of the Reclamation Service, from June 17 to December 1, 1902, with the accompanying maps, of which 2,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate and 3,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives.

LAURA J. SNAPP.

Mr. McCUMBER submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That all papers on file with the Secretary of the Senate accompanying S. 2435, a bill granting an increase of pension to Samuel C. Snapp, introduced in the Fifty-seventh Congress, be returned to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Pensions, to be by him forwarded to Laura J. Snapp, widow of Samuel C. Snapp, deceased, no adverse report having been made thereon.

GLEN HAVEN CHANNEL, WISCONSIN.

Mr. SPOONER. I submit a resolution to be referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Commerce is instructed to investigate and report, at the earliest practicable day, whether the Government work in the Mississippi River, the boundary line between the States of Wisconsin and Iowa, opposite the county of Grant, in the State of Wisconsin, so far as constructed, or if the same shall be completed as planned, will close or render unnavigable the Glen Haven Channel, along the Wisconsin shore, which has been navigable for rafts and steamboats for over forty years.

Resolved, That said committee is authorized to conduct said investigation by full committee or a subcommittee, and shall have power to send for persons and papers, examine witnesses under oath, employ a stenographer, and sit during the sessions of the Senate, at such times and places as the committee may determine; and the actual and necessary expenses of said investigation shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

Mr. ALLISON. With reference to the resolution, I wish to say to the Senator from Wisconsin and the Senate that I understand the Secretary of War has already selected a committee of engineers to make this investigation. I think perhaps that investigation will be sufficient without invoking the attention of a committee of this body.

Mr. SPOONER. Of course I was aware and am aware of the fact that the Secretary of War has designated certain engineers to make this investigation. I take the liberty of very much preferring, if I can induce the Senate to do it, to have the investigation made by a committee of this body. There is no constitutional objection to my introducing the resolution—

Mr. ALLISON. None whatever.

Mr. SPOONER. And having it referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate. The Senator and myself will have some interchange of views probably when the resolution is reported by that committee and the question arises on its adoption.

Mr. ALLISON. Very well.

Mr. SPOONER. I will not call it up in the Senator's absence.

Mr. ALLISON. That is entirely satisfactory. It is a matter of great moment—

Mr. SPOONER. So it is.

Mr. ALLISON. And I would be very much gratified, of course, to have the Committee on Commerce go out there and make this investigation.

Mr. SPOONER. It is a matter of so much moment that I want the Senate to get the facts and ascertain whether the engineer officers of this Government can destroy a channel in an interstate stream. I do not want to interfere with the Iowa channel—

Mr. ALLISON. I understand it.

Mr. SPOONER. But I should like to have the Wisconsin channel protected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution has been referred. Debate is proceeding by unanimous consent.

Mr. SPOONER. I was proceeding by unanimous consent. Does the Chair object?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair does not object.

Mr. SPOONER. I am through.

CHESAPEAKE BAY IMPROVEMENT.

Mr. MARTIN submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to cause an examination and survey to be made of the channel from deep water in Hampton Roads to the Norfolk Navy-Yard, with a view to widening and straightening the same and increasing the depth thereof to 35 feet, and to submit estimates for such improvement to that depth; and also estimates for such improvement to a depth of 30 feet.

REPORT OF COMMISSIONER OF NAVIGATION.

On motion of Mr. FRYE, it was

Ordered, That there be printed 600 additional bound copies of the report of the Commissioner of Navigation for 1903, for the use of the Bureau of Navigation.

MILITARY POST NEAR COLUMBUS, OHIO.

Mr. FORAKER. I ask unanimous consent for the consideration at this time of a bill of only twelve lines, with respect to which there is considerable urgency. It is the bill (S. 1656) to provide for the purchase of land for a military post at or near Columbus, Ohio.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with an amendment, to add the following as a new section:

SEC. 2. That the act approved June 30, 1902, appropriating a sum of money not exceeding the proceeds of the sale of Columbus Barracks, Ohio, for the purchase of this land, is modified accordingly.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That to enable the Secretary of War, in his discretion, to purchase about 2,000 acres of land for a military post at or near Columbus, Ohio, the sum of \$180,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to be immediately available, is hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

SEC. 2. That the act approved June 30, 1902, appropriating a sum of money not exceeding the proceeds of the sale of Columbus Barracks, Ohio, for the purchase of this land, is modified accordingly.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REPUBLIC OF PANAMA.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further morning business, the Chair will lay before the Senate resolutions coming over in their order. The Chair will state that there are a few of these resolutions on the table subject to the call of the respective Senators offering them. The Chair will not now lay those before the Senate, but will lay before the Senate the following resolution—

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President—

Mr. HOAR. I desire to call up the resolution I offered the other day.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will then lay that resolution before the Senate.

Mr. HOAR. I desire to speak for only a few minutes upon the resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution heretofore submitted by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR], which will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution submitted by Mr. HOAR on the 9th instant, as follows:

Resolved, That the President be requested, if not, in his judgment incompatible with the public interest, to communicate to the Senate such facts as may be in his possession, or in that of any of the Executive Departments, as will show whether at the time of the ratification of the treaty with the Republic of Panama, lately communicated to the Senate, Panama had successfully established its independence, had lawfully adopted a constitution, and had given authority to the persons with whom said treaty purports to have been made to negotiate and ratify the same;

Also, the population of said Republic of Panama at that time, its capacity for self-government, and the race and character of the persons composing it; Also, whether the officials negotiating or ratifying the treaty on the part of Panama had any personal or private interest in or relation to the construction of a canal across the Isthmus of Panama;

Also, whether the constitution of the Republic of Colombia authorized the secession of Panama therefrom, and whether Colombia was prevented by the action of the United States or by any officer or force under the jurisdiction of the same from attempting to assert its authority or to prevent such secession, and what instructions, if any, had been given by the Government of the United States to such officers, whether civil, military, or naval, and whether if any action had been taken by such officers without special authority what action was so taken, and whether such action has been approved or disapproved by the Government of the United States;

Also, at what time information of any revolution or resistance to the Government of Colombia in Panama was received by the Government of the United States or any Department thereof, and whether any information was received of any expected or intended revolution before it occurred, and the date of such information.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words upon that resolution. I shall refer to nothing except what is already contained in the documents which have been sent to Congress. If at any time I shall say anything which would seem to any Senator to belong to the executive session, I shall desist.

No man in this country desires more eagerly than I do—I doubt if there be a man living who desires so eagerly as I do—to support the Administration and to act with my Republican associates in this matter. I desire the building of the canal. It is one of the great landmarks, rarely found once in a century, in the progress of humanity, bringing nations together and making the whole world kin. I hope it is a laudable ambition—at any rate it is my ambition—that this may be accomplished in my time by the party with which I have acted from my youth and by the Administration of my choice. Nothing can be more delightful to me than that it shall be accomplished by the President of whom I have supposed I had the right to speak as an honored and valued personal friend. It is a dear ambition, also, that my vote may be recorded in its favor. But let this great transaction be wrought in the great way which alone

is worthy of it. Let it be brought to pass, if it may be, by the unanimous consent of all parties and the united action of all the people. If, unhappily, that be impossible, at least let it be without the taint or the suspicion of national dishonor.

Now, Mr. President, I do not care to inquire too scrupulously whether the President has waited long enough for his recognition of the de facto government in Panama. The question whether and when he shall recognize any government is left, in general, by the Constitution to his sole discretion, a discretion which must be binding upon all other departments. There are, I think, cases where the lawmaking power has a like discretion. But this need not be discussed now. I do not think he could get much light to guide his feet in dealing with Panama from the conditions which occurred during our civil war. During the impeachment of Warren Hastings, when the lawyers in the House of Commons complained of the delays and the slow process of the trial, Burke answered that when these gentlemen cited the precedents of their own courts as guides for the procedure of that great tribunal it was as if a rabbit that bred four times a year should seek to prescribe the period necessary for the gestation of an elephant. Certainly the reverse is true. The elephant that breeds once in twelve months can afford no rule for judging of the period of gestation of a field mouse or a humming bird.

What we want to know is this: Whether our Administration, knowing or expecting beforehand that a revolution was coming, so arranged matters that the revolution, whether peaceable or forcible, should be permitted to go on without interruption, and only took measures to stop the Republic of Colombia from preventing it. Did the President, or the Secretary of State, or any other Department of our Government, purposely prevent Colombia from anticipating and preventing a breach of the peace and a disturbance of the transit across the Isthmus by sending her troops there before it happened, and so virtually let the revolution take place, and say to Colombia, "You shall take no precautions to stop it?" Did we, in substance, say to Colombia, "We will not allow you to prevent a revolution in your province of Panama by moving your forces there" before it broke out?

Now, it appears that the uprising took place in the city of Panama at about 6 o'clock in the afternoon of the 3d of November. That appears by the dispatch of Mr. Ehrman, United States vice-consul-general (H. Doc. No. 8, 58th Cong., part 2, p. 3), and by the dispatch from Mr. Hubbard, from Colon (H. Doc. No. 8, 58th Cong., part 1, p. 21).

There is no intimation anywhere that our Administration had any knowledge of any disturbance before that time, except that at 3.40 on the 3d of November Mr. Loomis, Acting Secretary of State, sends a telegram that an uprising on the Isthmus is reported—that is before it actually broke out or was known in Colon and Panama or to Colombia—and received a reply at 8.15 of the same day, "No uprising yet. Reported will be in the night." (H. Doc. No. 8, part 1, p. 2.)

Now, at 11.18 p. m. Mr. Loomis sends a telegram to the Nashville, instructing the commander of that vessel to make every effort to prevent Government troops at Colon from proceeding to Panama. (H. Doc. No. 8, part 1, p. 2.)

At 4.28 p. m. on the 3d of November Mr. Loomis telegraphs to Mr. Malmros at Colon, asking him whether he received and delivered to the Nashville a message "last night or early this morning." (H. Doc. No. 8, part 1, p. 7.)

At 4 p. m. November 3 the Department of State asks our consul at Colon whether troops from the Colombian vessel *Cartagena* are disembarking or preparing to land. Twenty-eight minutes after he asks whether message to Nashville men to stop them has been delivered. (H. Doc. No. 8, part 1, p. 7.)

Why this great anxiety on the part of the Government at Washington before any disturbance whatever? The answer is found in the fact that at 2.35 p. m. the *Cartagena* had arrived, which was not expected until November 10. (H. Doc. No. 8, part 1, p. 7.)

At 8.45 p. m. our Department sends orders that the troops landed at Colon must not proceed to Panama. (H. Doc. No. 8, part 1, p. 8.) This was before receipt of any tidings of the revolution, which was first heard of at 9.50 on the same day. (H. Doc. No. 8, part 1, p. 2.)

Up to this time nobody has obstructed or threatened to obstruct the railroad or interfere in any way with transit across the Isthmus. (Same, pp. 8 and 9.)

Our commander, before the occurrences at Panama were known at Colon, or before there was any knowledge of an expected rising there, had refused to allow Government forces to proceed peaceably to Panama from Colon. This was by direct orders from Washington. (Same, pp. 19, 21.) These orders had been given November 2, not only to the Nashville, but to the *Marblehead*, to the *Atlanta*, and I suppose to the *Concord*, though that does not distinctly appear. (See pp. 19-21.)

On November 7, 1903, at 1.40 p. m., the Department of State received a communication from Philippe Bunau-Varilla, dated at

New York, in which he says: "In selecting for its first representative at Washington the veteran servant and champion of the Panama Canal, my Government has evidently sought to show that it considers a loyal and earnest devotion to that most heroic conception of human genius as both a solemn duty and the essential purpose of its existence."

The Republic of Panama was recognized by the President on or before November 6. (Same, p. 13.) The precise date of that recognition is not given in these documents.

It does not appear from the President's communication or, so far as I know, in any document conveniently accessible to the Senate that any one of the revolutions that have taken place in that country has heretofore disturbed the transit across the Isthmus, although that has sometimes been apprehended.

The following order was sent to the Nashville on November 2 (Monday):

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D. C., November 2, 1903.

NASHVILLE (care American consul), Colon:

Maintain free and uninterrupted transit. If interruption threatened by armed force occupy the line of railroad. Prevent landing of any armed force with hostile intent, either Government or insurgent, either at Colon, Porto Bello, or other point. Send copy of instructions to senior officer present at Panama upon arrival of Boston. Have sent copy of instructions and have telegraphed Dixie to proceed with all possible dispatch from Kingston to Colon. Government force reported approaching the Isthmus in vessels. Prevent their landing if in your judgment this would precipitate a conflict. Acknowledgment is required.

DARLING, Acting.

So it is clear, if this be the whole story that we have in these documents, that at least twenty-four hours, perhaps forty-eight hours, before the revolution broke out our Government had instructed its man-of-war to prevent the Government of Colombia from doing anything in anticipation of the revolution to prevent it. This message, as appears from the dispatch of November 3, Tuesday, had been sent on November 1, Sunday, three days before the revolution. November 3, at 8.45 p. m., before our Government had received any notice of the revolution, orders had been sent to the consul at Colon that the troops should not be allowed to proceed to Panama. The intended revolutionary movement had been known to a very few persons only at Colon up to 8 a. m. on the 4th of November. It was not known by the Government party in Colon, by the Conservative party, or by the Colombian forces at Colon when the dispatch received at 3.35 in the afternoon of November 4 was sent. (Same, pp. 8 and 9.)

Now, Mr. President, I want to know, I think the American people want to know, and have a right to know, whether this mighty policeman, instructed to keep the peace on that Isthmus, seeing a man about to attack another, before he had struck his blow, manacled the arms of the man attacked, so that he could not defend himself, leaving the assailant free, and then instantly proceeded to secure from the assailant the pocketbook of the victim, on the ground that he was de facto the owner?

Mr. President, it may be said that it is almost an affront, certainly a great incivility, to ask such a question. It may be said that anybody who knows the President knows that he is incapable of intrigue or indirection or artifice. And there is very great force in that suggestion. From all I have ever seen or known, Mr. Roosevelt is the last man living who would be capable of such a thing as that. His faults, if he have them, I have always expected would come from a brave and honest and perhaps somewhat impetuous nature that would ever seek to attain great objects in a great way. But the President himself has suggested and invited the desire for this explanation. He has thought it due to himself that the American people should know that nothing of the kind could be imputed to him. He has repelled with scorn the suggestion of such an imputation. He has taken the uncommon step of communicating to the press extracts from a message which he had prepared to send to Congress, written before the revolution occurred in Panama, in order that the American people might know that it was impossible that he had expected it and still more impossible that he had done anything to bring it about. I did not think myself that such an assurance to the public was at all necessary. If the President had sent for any member of the Senate and had proposed to show him that message, he would, I think, have been told there was no occasion for him to seek to prove by any evidence beyond that of his own character that he had had nothing to do with any indirection or artifice. But he decided otherwise. And having decided otherwise, I suppose he will like to have the imperfect evidence afforded by the communication to the House of Representatives and by the message at the beginning of the present session made complete, and whatever is lacking to a complete answer to the charges which have been made in the press supplied.

Now, Mr. President, as the matter stands on the information given to the House in Document No. 8, the shores of Colombia were patrolled by armed vessels of the United States in order that that Government—the Government of the country—should not take any steps to prevent it.

It does not appear in that document where or from whom our Administration secured the information that led to these orders.

According to the documents sent to the House by the President the first tidings of any revolution that came either from Panama or Colon, or any expected revolution, came November 3, the day the revolution happened. As the statement is now left in the official communication to Congress, this revolution was known at Washington before it was known on the Isthmus. All our Government, by its own statement, seems to have done in its anxiety that transit should not be disturbed was not to take measures that violence should not occur, but to take measures that violence should not be prevented. It performed its duty of keeping uninterrupted the transit across the Isthmus only by interrupting it itself—interrupting it itself in its most sacred and rightful use, that of the lawful Government of the country moving its own troops over its own territory that it might prevent a breach of its peace and an unlawful revolution against its authority.

Mr. President, is there any doubt that, as now standing unexplained, this was an act of war?

Colombia was a friendly nation. She owned that territory. We have admitted all that by receiving a minister from her, and sending a minister to her, and negotiating with her for a purchase of her rights.

It is said that she negotiated a treaty with us by her Executive, and then that her Executive took no steps to persuade her Congress to ratify it. Indeed, she did exactly what we did with Denmark thirty years ago, in the case of St. Thomas; what we have done lately with several commercial treaties, and what the present Administration did with Great Britain within a year in the matter of the Newfoundland fishery treaty.

Is not this an act of war upon a friendly though weak nation as it stands in these imperfect documents? Suppose under the Pauncefote treaty, where Great Britain guarantees the neutrality of the canal, she were to send an armed force to keep us off when we were sending our troops in a ship to do the same thing? Should not we repeat to his lordship at the foreign office Mr. Adams's simple and sublime sentence, "It is superfluous to observe to your lordship that this is war?"

There is another thing upon which, it seems to me, it might not be unbecoming even the dignity of the Department of State, or that of the President himself, to afford his countrymen the satisfaction of an explicit denial. Of that, however, the judgment of either of these high officials will be better than mine. Some weeks ago the editor of a newspaper in Panama, named Joseph Duque, visited this country in the interest of a projected revolution. He had a conference with the Secretary of State, if the statements widely circulated in the newspapers be true.

He has since said in his paper that he told the Secretary that it was proposed to have a revolution on the 23d of September, and that the Secretary told him "that was too early; that revolutions commonly required some preparation." The revolution was, in fact, postponed until November 3, the evening after our elections.

Now, it may be true that that story is not worth contradicting. I confess I do not believe a word of it myself. It does not seem to me, I am frank to say, to be Mr. Secretary Hay's style. But it will be remembered that the President thought he owed it to his countrymen to give to the press parts of a message never sent in that he might so refute a charge of dishonor made against him by a newspaper in New York. I suppose the Senate, certainly, to be as much in his confidence as the newspapers of the country. I suppose the explicit statement of an editor in Panama whom he does not know may possibly seem to him as deserving of notice as the charge of an editor in New York whom he does know. At any rate, in this, as in the whole inquiry, the matter is left to his judgment, in which I hope and believe we shall all of us, the Senate and his countrymen, be very desirous to acquiesce.

One thing more. I do not observe that any country on this continent has yet recognized the Republic of Panama. Russia and Germany and Austria and China have hastened to recognize it. France, whose people have a strong pecuniary interest in the sale of the old canal property, has joined them, and, I believe, three or four of the northern European states, but, except France, no republic from the Gulf to Cape Horn. The nations so far stand aloof. Do you think it well to proclaim to the sixteen republics at the south that if they are weak, or even if they are liable to frequent revolution, we will deal with them hereafter, if we fancy it for our interest, as we are charged with having dealt with Colombia?

Are we willing to say that if this revolution had not happened we meant to take that strip of territory by the strong hand and to pay Colombia what we should think proper damages? Do you claim that every South American nation holds its property subject to our right of eminent domain?

We have decided that the Panama route is the best route. But there are a good many people who think the Nicaragua route better and that we must yet go there. We all thought so three years

ago. If that turn out to be true, are we going to take that in the same way? Mr. Webster—a wise man in his day—thought the best route was the route by Tehuantepec. If Panama had no right to make terms for her Isthmus, Mexico will have no right to make terms for hers, if in the exigencies of a growing commerce we think that to be the better route or that the commerce of the world needs another. Is this doctrine of eminent domain, of which we have heard so much, likely to help us get the coveted markets of South America or to make them like us better as customers or producers? I think, Mr. President, that we ought to have, and that we ought to have now, and if this resolution be adopted we shall have, the authoritative declaration by the President of the United States and Congress which will compose and forever put an end to these fears, whether they exist at home or abroad.

If this be our policy and it go on, if any disaster come to the great Republic—which Heaven avert—and our country shall perish, she will be mourned only by despots, and her overthrow will be hailed with exultation and triumph by every people in the Western Hemisphere from the Arctic Ocean to Cape Horn.

Mr. President, the question of one revolution more or less in a little South American republic may seem of infinitesimal importance. The question whether we wait five minutes, or five days, or five years before we recognize a new government is not of great importance, if that be all. Even then, if this five-minute act of revolution be absolutely contemporaneous with our getting for ourselves the larger part of the country against whom the revolution takes place, it seems to me to be due to our own character to walk circumspectly. But we are setting a great precedent in international law and declaring by an example far more impressive than any precept what rule of conduct we propose to observe in the future toward sixteen South American republics who are all existing to-day under like conditions. We are saying to every despotic country in Europe that, so far as we are concerned, there will never be any objection, any active opposition, or even any moral condemnation on our part if they do the same thing when they shall see fit.

Now, I do not undertake to say—I do not say—that there has been anything, so far, on the part of our Government liable to any just criticism. But the American people and the Senate, as yet, know only part of the story. They are, in my judgment, entitled to know the whole, and to know it now, before action be taken upon the Panama treaty.

We are entitled to know it in the way prescribed by the established custom of the Government for a century—by an official communication from the Executive to one or the other House of Congress, and not to get it through some individual Senator, whose information may be colored, unconsciously, by his own wishes, or by what he fancies to be the wishes of anybody else, still less by the unofficial public utterances of the representatives of foreign states, or even of officials in our own Executive Departments.

Mr. GORMAN, Mr. CULLOM, Mr. MITCHELL, and Mr. FORAKER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Maryland. Mr. MITCHELL. Will the Senator from Maryland yield to me for a moment?

Mr. GORMAN. I will for a question. I simply wish to say a word.

Mr. MITCHELL. I simply desire to call attention to a notice which I gave some days ago that I would address the Senate to-day on another subject immediately after the conclusion of the morning business. I yield—

Mr. GORMAN. I understand that. That will come at 2 o'clock. If the Senator will pardon me, I will not be long, as he is aware. Of course I do not want to interfere with him and shall not.

Mr. MITCHELL. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. GORMAN. Mr. President, I think the matter now pending before the Senate is of such importance that I should say one or two words in response to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR.]

First, I think I can say, with perfect confidence in the accuracy of the statement, that, with one or two exceptions, there is no Senator on this side of the Chamber who is opposed to a canal, or who is not as earnestly in favor of its construction across the Isthmus at one of the two points selected by the Congress of the United States as is any Senator on the opposite side, and that whatever may be said here will relate only to the merits of the case now before us, being always favorable to the construction of a canal.

Mr. President, I think the country is to be congratulated that again the Senator from Massachusetts, a great leader on the other side of the Chamber, whose reputation is world-wide, has followed the examples that we have witnessed in this body time and time again. When some question arises wherein the honor of the American people is involved, there are always enough patriotic Senators to join the minority in staying the Executive power

when it trenches upon the right of the Senate or of Congress, or attempts, without the consent of Congress, by an improper and inexcusable act, to involve the country in war.

Massachusetts, Mr. President, during the time I have witnessed the deliberations of this body has had other statesmen who have pursued the same course. I remember well the action of the magnificent Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. Sumner, notwithstanding all his loyalty to the Republican party and his extreme views as opposed to those of Democrats. It was when General Grant, who had been the great captain of the Union Army, and who was beloved by the people of the North and respected by the South for his generosity at the surrender, was President of the United States, with a power greater than that possessed by any man since President Washington. He attempted, in a little insignificant case in Santo Domingo, to override and ride roughshod over the will of Congress, and Massachusetts had a statesman who sacrificed his position in his own party. But he will live in history as a patriot, as will the present Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. President, the facts are what we desire. The undue influence of the executive branch of this Government in the consideration of treaties and in legislation has been growing and growing until the Senate has in many cases only complied with the wish of the Executive. Unwisely, I think, even in the matter of treaties, Presidents have come to the Senate to select commissioners to negotiate them. It is an unfortunate precedent in my judgment. But the power of the Administration goes on and on. We see Cabinet officers traveling over the country, presenting the political views of the Administration, with the sole view of political control and the Associated Press naturally gets from the executive branch of the Government suggestions and information desired to be communicated to the country.

The President of the United States, with doubtful propriety, in my judgment, telegraphs his instructions to conventions in the States as to their political action. But in this case there has occurred the most flagrant action by the Executive Department that has ever taken place in the Government, and, in my judgment, outside of the question of a canal at Nicaragua or at Panama, it ought to be resented by the Senate without regard to party.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER] says a two-thirds majority is required to ratify a treaty. Yes; and I say there ought to be two-thirds in the Senate who will say to the executive branch of this Government, "When under the seal of secrecy you have communicated to the Senate a treaty with a foreign power, whether a substantial one or one only manufactured for a purpose, when your mouth, Mr. President, and mine are closed to the public discussion of matters heretofore considered sacred between the Senate and the President, that your Assistant Secretary of State shall not, before the injunction of secrecy has been removed, which was only done yesterday, either on his own motion or by the suggestion or permission of any one in higher authority, invade the rights of this body by discussing the question at a banquet in New York before a miscellaneous audience, giving to the banqueters greater information, if it be information, as I suppose it is, than the Senate of the United States has had from any branch of the executive department."

When Mr. Loomis made this speech in the city of New York, coming from him as an Assistant Secretary of the State Department, he told the country not alone the facts furnished us, but also made the broad assertion that the President of the United States had the courage and the knowledge and the patriotism to direct the landing of marines.

Here is Mr. Loomis's exact language, as reported in the New York Herald:

The President directed our meager naval force ashore, consisting of forty marines, to do what they could to preserve peace, order, and unimpeded transit across the Isthmus. He promptly recognized the de facto government as soon as he learned that it was in peaceful possession of the country.

In a previous paragraph of Mr. Loomis's speech, he informs us that—

The Colombian Congress, in utter bad faith, had rejected the treaty and adjourned; and, in less than a week's time and before the President could be reasonably expected to turn to the grave consideration of the Nicaragua route, the long-expected and inevitable revolution in Panama came to pass.

So, according to Mr. Loomis, the new Government, under the protection of our marines, was established. We virtually seized, by military power, a part of the territory of Colombia.

That, Mr. President, with the facts before us, is usurpation. No head of an autocratic government ever was guilty of a more audacious act. Newspaper critics draw a parallel between our President and Napoleon. Has it come to this, Mr. President, that we have a Napoleon, not only conducting the executive branch of the Government, which he is charged to do under his oath within the restrictions of the Constitution, but also taking action amounting to a declaration of war, which the Constitution says

Congress alone has the power to declare, and then omitting to give Congress all the facts but sifting out information through a Deputy Secretary of State at a banquet in New York?

Mr. ALDRICH. Will the Senator from Maryland allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. GORMAN. With pleasure.

Mr. ALDRICH. I do not know that I precisely understood the nature of the opening statement of the Senator from Maryland. I understood him to say in effect, speaking, I suppose, as the official organ of the reconcentrated Democracy on the other side, that a treaty which is now before the Senate for its consideration is to be refused consideration or rejected on account of some acts or alleged acts of the President of the United States or of some official of the United States. I think that purpose, if such be his purpose, should be made plain.

Mr. GORMAN. Mr. President, I have dealt with the Senator on this floor for a good many years, and I have never yet been able to make him fully understand me.

Mr. ALDRICH. That is not my fault, Mr. President.

Mr. GORMAN. Probably not.

Mr. ALDRICH. I have always been able to understand the Senator's proposition when he stated it in definite terms.

Mr. GORMAN. I state it so that anyone, except the Senator from Rhode Island, can understand it.

Mr. President, I am not to be diverted from what I desire to say in the few minutes that I have by the Senator from Rhode Island; but I will state to him that never, since I have occupied a seat upon this floor in the eighteen years I have now served, have I desired to consider any matter such as a treaty or our relation with a foreign government as a party man. I have known it to be done but once, and then by a united vote on the Republican side of the Chamber when Mr. Cleveland was President of the United States. I have never known a treaty to be ratified by an absolute party vote, but I have seen a treaty imperfect and, in my judgment, disgraceful in its terms forced to a vote by your party in its imperfect and acknowledged imperfect form.

Sir, the matter under discussion, I repeat, ought to be considered, as suggested by the Senator from Massachusetts, with all the facts, and I hope, I believe—no, I scarcely believe, but I hope—that the Senator from Rhode Island may get out of his thorough partisan shell and join us in considering it as an American Senator without regard to politics.

Now, Mr. President, what does this gentleman from the State Department in his address tell us? That but for the fact that we had this prompt Napoleonic action on the part of the President the war ships of France would have been on hand to coerce Colombia in the matter of the rights of the canal company and to prevent the forfeiture of the charter. What information could he have possessed? The revolution was manufactured in forty days. It was put in execution, and the recognition took place within thirty-six hours—indeed, by our time a little before it occurred, as I understand.

We recognize a Government of only three or five men, selected by nobody, but made secure by our naval officers and our agents who were looking after the canal. We negotiate with it a treaty, written here in Washington by our own officers, and the form gone through of signing the document with our agents, or the canal company's agents, claiming to be the Government of Panama. Mr. President, it is a time to inquire and to get the facts, and I say again to the Senator from Rhode Island, speaking for nobody but myself, if the facts are as I believe them to be, if it is not clearly shown that we have a better case than is presented to us now, I think it would be a patriotic duty for every Senator in the minority to assert the power given by the Constitution and say while we must have a canal, the first thing that we shall guard and protect is the honor of the American people. The Senator can not misunderstand that.

Mr. ALDRICH. Does the Senator go a step farther and say that they will reject this treaty?

Mr. GORMAN. No, Mr. President—

Mr. ALDRICH. I understand that what he says is tantamount to that, but I would be glad to have him put it in words.

Mr. GORMAN. I say to the Senator from Rhode Island that if the case stands as it is now, with only the information the Administration has furnished us up to this hour, we consider it a most objectionable transaction; and let me say to the Senator from Rhode Island when he talks about the responsibility, we can take the responsibility and say to the Administration, "Congress has directed you to do one of two things—to construct the canal and to do it without delay. When you can not get it at Panama, go to Nicaragua and construct it there, and at once." Yet Mr. Loomis in this speech has the audacity to say that the reason why no negotiations have been attempted with Costa Rica or Nicaragua, as provided by the Spooner Act, is because eminent engineers have said Nicaragua is not the proper route for the construction of the canal.

That statement I challenge. It can not be verified, for no engineer of importance in the country, and but one member of the Commission, I believe, expressed a doubt as to the feasibility of the Nicaraguan route.

After this speech was made I wanted to get the opinion of one of the chief engineers, a man of honor and regarded as among the best on the Commission. I sent for him last night and asked him if such a statement had ever been made by any important engineer in this country. His answer was unequivocally: "No; it is perfectly feasible. We believed that owing to the price (and it was only the paltry sum of \$5,000,000 that they based it on) Panama was the best route." But as to the feasibility, no one questioned it except this volunteer from the State Department who, in violation of all rules that ought to govern the two branches of the Government, proclaimed it at a banquet board in New York. Congress has determined, almost unanimously, that the Nicaraguan route is feasible; and the Canal Commission has likewise so decided, and has never reversed it.

Mr. President, I do not desire to do the President of the United States any injustice. I respect the office. I believe that whoever occupies it ought to have fair consideration. But the Executive must have a respect for Congress and special consideration for the Senate of the United States when it comes to the negotiation of treaties, for he can not make one without its consent. When the attempt is made to deprive us of all the facts I resent it; and it is not the first instance of such action and of such dictation to Congress. I have resented it in the past at the cost of estranging some of my political associates when we had a Democratic President of the United States. I accord President Roosevelt the same treatment. I ask of him, I demand of him, the right of the Senate to be informed of all the facts. Open your books and give us the information. If he fails to do it and will not give us any further information, speaking for myself, I can not sustain him, and I believe there is sufficient courage and patriotism on this side of the Chamber to stay him or any impetuous officer who attempts an imprudent act that may affect the entire country.

What I want, Mr. President, and what I believe the people want, not only in this case, but in all cases that may likely arise, is that there shall be nothing to disturb the business interests of this country, nothing that will put in jeopardy, because of the fear of some extreme action on the part of the Executive, the thrift and enterprise that we have so long enjoyed. Every thoughtful man recognizes the fact that we have for four years and more passed through an era of unexampled prosperity, of expansion, of reckless expenditures, of imprudent investments, and now the balance of the world, jealous of our prosperity, is putting obstacles in our way, and will continue to put in our way obstructions that will impair, have impaired, and are now seriously affecting every business interest.

A war party, it may be said, is in this country never defeated.

Mr. SPOONER. What kind of a party?

Mr. GORMAN. A war party—a party that is conducting a war. Can it be in the mind of any man that a desperate political chance, growing out of the depressed conditions, makes it necessary for political success that the flag and the armies of the country may be exhibited in some foreign land to strengthen the party and secure party power? If such a thought has entered the mind of any man, here is the body to stay it. Who can be seriously troubled if the Senate in this case, as in all others, will stand for the safety of the business interests, for the peace and prosperity of the mechanic and the wage-earner? The fathers created this body so that it could prevent unwise and imprudent action. It has but seldom permitted the excitement of the hour and the desires of ambitious men to sway the Government and put in jeopardy the honor of the country or its commercial prosperity.

Mr. FORAKER. Mr. President, when I read in the morning paper of yesterday—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Before the Senator from Ohio proceeds, if he will pardon the Chair, the hour of 2 o'clock has arrived, when, under the rule, the Senate will proceed to the general Calendar. This resolution has now received the usual consideration in the morning hour up to 2 o'clock. There are other resolutions on the desk which have been by unanimous consent laid over for this morning. What disposition will the Senate have made of this resolution and all the others which have been lying over, which, without any instructions, would go to the Calendar?

Mr. FORAKER. I was about to make a motion with respect to the resolution which has been under consideration. Is it in order for me to proceed now?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair would like to have the direction of the Senate as to what shall be done with the resolutions that are still on the table.

Mr. FORAKER. I move that the resolution which has been under consideration, the one offered by the Senator from Massa-

chusetts [Mr. HOAR], be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations; and I desire to make some remarks on the resolution.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President—

Mr. ALLISON. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Ohio may complete the remarks that he has undertaken.

Mr. TILLMAN. Would it be fair to the rest of us that the thoughts we now have in our minds shall be bottled up until the subject—

Mr. SPOONER. Until to-morrow.

Mr. TILLMAN. I am afraid they might effervesce. I protest that, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MITCHELL] having a speech ready to deliver and having given notice, he ought to be allowed to go on and leave this matter to come up to-morrow, so that we shall all have an equal show, or else let him subside and let the Senate as a whole proceed in this interesting discussion.

Mr. FORAKER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair has recognized the Senator from Ohio and he has the floor. What will happen to the resolutions must be an after consideration.

Mr. FORAKER. I wish to say before I proceed that the Senator from Oregon gave a notice, and I do not wish to interfere with his right to address the Senate at this time if he desires to insist upon it.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President—

Mr. BACON. Will the Senator from Oregon pardon me just a moment?

Mr. MITCHELL. Certainly.

Mr. BACON. The Chair has stated that in the absence of action on the part of the Senate with reference to the various resolutions they would each go to the Calendar. Therefore, I think before the Senator from Oregon proceeds there ought to be a disposition made as to the resolutions. I simply desire to say as to one of them, the one introduced by myself, that after conference with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH] he agreed to ask that the Senate would consent that that resolution might continue to lie on the table subject to call. I think I am correct in that.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I rise to make a request.

Mr. BACON. I make the same request as to all of them, if in order.

Mr. GALLINGER. I rose to make the same request. I ask that all of the resolutions may go over without prejudice.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the resolutions will go over without prejudice. Then, on the resolution submitted by the Senator from Massachusetts, the Senator from Ohio is entitled to the floor.

Mr. MITCHELL. I understand that under the unvarying rule of the Senate I would be entitled to proceed now if I so insisted. I yield to the Senator from Ohio, but at the conclusion of his remarks I shall desire to take the floor.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I dislike to interfere with that arrangement, and I think it shall not be necessary to interfere. I suggest to the Senator from Oregon that upon a controverted point, which it now appears will take on somewhat of political division, it is hardly fair to yield to one side, serving notice at the same time that he would not yield to the other.

Mr. President, I am not going to make a point of order that a Senator can not yield the floor to another Senator without unanimous consent, though I remember distinctly that point of order was made against me here one afternoon, and the Chair sustained it. I shall be glad to hear the Senator from Ohio. I can not always agree with him, but it always delights me to hear him. But if it should be that the Senator from Ohio says what calls for an answer I hardly think it fair to cut this side off.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair had recognized the Senator from Ohio, and he is now occupying the floor.

Mr. MITCHELL. Will the Senator yield to me?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Texas has been speaking in the time of the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BAILEY. Then the Senator from Oregon was mistaken in saying that he yielded to the Senator from Ohio, and that is what misled me.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognized the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. MITCHELL. Will the Senator from Ohio yield to me for a moment?

Mr. FORAKER. Certainly.

Mr. MITCHELL. I have been placed in a false position by the Senator from Texas, and I wish to straighten matters out. My understanding has been that there have already been two speeches made on one side of this question and none on the other side; and I thought it nothing but fair that the other side of the controversy should have a hearing from one Senator. Both the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Maryland have spoken on the same side, as I understood their speeches. There has been no answer to either of those speeches on this side. I thought it

nothing more than fair and right in the interest of fair play and decency that there should be at least one speech on this side as a kind of offset to the two speeches on the other side.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. President, I rise to an inquiry as to the order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state his inquiry.

Mr. MORGAN. I understood the Chair to announce a while ago a unanimous agreement that all the undisposed-of resolutions were to be passed over without prejudice.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Except those that were on the table subject to the call of the Senator who offered them. Of course they remain there subject to call.

Mr. MORGAN. The resolution of the Senator from Massachusetts has been called?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It has been called.

Mr. MORGAN. Is it not then passed over under the unanimous consent just now given?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the present unanimous consent it will go over.

Mr. MORGAN. I think it has gone over under the unanimous consent.

Mr. ALDRICH. I do not think it has.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair has recognized the Senator from Ohio, who is entitled to the floor from that recognition.

Mr. FORAKER. I have not yielded the floor except for an interruption. The Senator would not have insisted upon my yielding to him if I had not shown him that courtesy. I do not understand that the Senator from Texas does make any such point.

Mr. BAILEY. Oh, no. Will the Senator yield to me just a moment?

Mr. FORAKER. Certainly.

Mr. BAILEY. I desire simply to say, in response to the Senator from Oregon, that it is very far from any purpose of mine to do him or any other Senator an injustice; and in making the suggestion that in common fairness when he yielded to one side he ought to yield to the other, I had for the moment overlooked the fact that the Senator from Massachusetts had taken a position similar to that of the Senator from Maryland, the effect of which is—

Mr. HOAR. Will the Senator allow me to say I had overlooked that fact, too? [Laughter.]

Mr. BAILEY. I leave that to be reconciled between the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Oregon. A friend from another State called me out of the Chamber at the time and I had overlooked that, or else I would not have suggested that it was unfair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Ohio is entitled to the floor.

Mr. FORAKER. Mr. President, I was about to say, when interrupted, that when yesterday morning I read in the paper an account of the proceedings of the Democratic caucus held the preceding evening I knew there was trouble ahead, for the account of those proceedings I read stated that at that caucus it had been resolved and determined that every member of the Democratic party in the Senate should vote as two-thirds of that membership should decide on every question voted upon in the Senate in every instance, except only when such a vote would interfere with the conscience of some Democratic member.

Mr. TILLMAN. Something you have not got on that side. [Laughter.]

Mr. FORAKER. I knew then that the vote would be, under all circumstances, when a two-thirds membership had so decreed it, a unit vote. I must confess, however, that my confidence in that idea was somewhat shaken when in the course of the debate in the Senate yesterday the Senator from South Carolina, who has just interrupted me, showed such remarkable familiarity with the Scriptures. [Laughter.] I concluded then that in all probability he was the particular Senator who was had in mind when that provisional exception was made. [Laughter.]

I was prepared, Mr. President, by that account of what had occurred in the Democratic caucus to hear without surprise the remarks of the eloquent and distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] in the course of his speech yesterday when he told us there would be hereafter no White House Democratic Senators; that the Democratic party, which had ruled this country for sixty years practically without interruption before the war, but for reasons satisfactory to the American people had not been allowed to govern the country since, except for a brief four years, had at last become rejuvenated, reorganized, concentrated, and that they were now prepared to go into the national contest of 1904 shoulder to shoulder, determined to carry their flag to victory.

I was not surprised, therefore, when I realized that an attack

was being made in this Chamber upon the Administration, an attack especially directed at President Roosevelt; but I was surprised when I saw that attack made by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR]; and I believe the whole country will be surprised when they read the character of speech that has been made, and when reading it they realize the sincerity of the eloquent tribute paid to the Senator from Massachusetts by the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. GORMAN], who now leads, according to popular report, the Democratic party in the Senate, and hopes to lead the Democratic party in the campaign of 1904.

Mr. President, I do not intend here in this open session to say all that I feel prompted to say about the character of the speech which has been made by the Senator from Massachusetts.

He remarked in his opening sentences that if any Senator felt as he proceeded that his speech should be made in executive instead of open session he would at any time yield, as I understood him, for that order to be made. It is possible that is a sufficient apology and explanation for him to make, entertaining the views he did, for making that speech in open session; but I submit to the judgment even of our Democratic friends, who have united for the purposes of victory in the next campaign, that, looking in a nonpartisan way, as we all should and as the Senator from Maryland [Mr. GORMAN] says he always does when we consider international questions and relations, that speech should have been made in executive session and not in the open Senate, or, Mr. President, as some one suggests to me within my hearing, it should never have been made at all. But, Mr. President, it has been made, and it is for us to consider and to deal with as we may think we should.

It ought to have been made in executive session, if it was to be made at all, not alone because it involved an attack upon the Administration, but because it involved an attack upon our country as well. There is a treaty now before the Senate with respect to this identical matter, a treaty concerning a great transaction, of which the whole world is witness. All the nations have our action under consideration. It does seem to me that it would have been the part of both patriotism and wisdom, certainly the part of conservatism, for the Senator from Massachusetts to have waited until that treaty, involving all these transactions which he has discussed, could be considered in the committee where it is pending, and then be considered here in executive session of the Senate, where international relations and international questions can be considered without offense to anyone—

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President—

Mr. FORAKER. Wait a minute—and where, Mr. President, all the information called for by this resolution could have been secured just as well as here in the open Senate.

Therefore it is, I say, I criticize that speech because of the fact that any purpose the Senator could have had in mind to subserve, so far as giving information and the benefit of his views to his brother Senators is concerned, could have been subserved better behind the doors in executive session than in the open Senate, where the words spoken will be taken up and spread broadcast before the world as words of criticism coming from the Senate of the United States upon the President of the United States in this great matter. I doubt not the President has acted from sentiments and motives of the highest and the loftiest patriotism and the purest intention to subserve American good.

Now I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. TILLMAN. I should like to ask the Senator from Ohio, who seems to be informed on this question and has assumed the rôle of championing the President's action, defending and explaining it, if he knows, and is willing to tell the Senate and the country, anything about the authenticity or reliability or truthfulness of the reports which we read in the daily newspapers of the preparations now actively in progress by our Chief of Staff and his subordinates for mobilizing 5,000 American soldiers to march on Bogota? Is that all a part of the same policy as to this nebulous or baby Republic that was born in some back room? If we are going to have war precipitated by the Executive while we are trying to discuss a treaty, we ought to know it.

Mr. FORAKER. I am always glad to be interrupted by the Senator from South Carolina when he simply wants to ask a question. He has asked one now, and I should take pleasure in answering it if I could, but I have no knowledge of any such matters as his question is directed to. I have only the knowledge in regard to these matters that is common knowledge to all Senators, or at least to all Senators who seek light.

Mr. TILLMAN. Was not such information given out at the White House?

Mr. FORAKER. Nothing has been given out to me at the White House.

Mr. TILLMAN. Ah!

Mr. FORAKER. If the Senator desires any information from the White House, I suggest that he apply.

Now, Mr. President, having said that much in a prefatory way, I want to say something about the merit of this transaction which has been so severely criticised by the Senator from Massachusetts. He reads a lot of telegrams and draws therefrom an inference, which he states as his conclusion, to the effect that this Government, although denying, as it has been denied over and over again, any part whatever in any connivance or intrigue in regard to the matter, was yet proceeding in such a way that no other conclusion could be deduced therefrom.

Mr. President, as I read these telegrams in the light of our duty and obligation to Panama with respect to the transit across the Isthmus, I see no occasion to draw therefrom any inference except only that the President of the United States was alert to do, in a patriotic way, his duty as the President of the United States.

Mr. HOAR. Will the Senator allow me to say a word?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. FORAKER. I do.

Mr. HOAR. I wish to say that the Senator totally misunderstands and, misunderstanding, totally perverts what I have either said or thought.

Mr. FORAKER. I do not know to what particular remark of mine the Senator from Massachusetts has reference, but I submit to Senators who listened to the Senator from Massachusetts that I have said nothing in answer to the speech of the Senator from Massachusetts that I was not warranted in saying; and I will add that I have not said, and I will not say here in this presence, to go into the RECORD and to be spread before the world, all that I feel I should say in answer to that speech.

Mr. HOAR. If the Senator will permit me, I do not propose to be put by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. GORMAN] or by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. FORAKER] into any false position. The Senator is welcome—and I do not think he will find anybody afraid of him—to make any comment on anything I say in the Senate that he chooses, here or anywhere else, publicly or privately. I said this—

Mr. FORAKER. Mr. President, I do not—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. FORAKER. No; I do not yield any longer—

Mr. HOAR. Very well.

Mr. FORAKER. Unless the Senator will tell me that he is going to be very brief about it. The Senator came in here and read a carefully prepared speech, which will go into the RECORD precisely as he read it to the Senate, and every Senator and all the country can see precisely what he said. What I am saying will be reported and printed in that same RECORD precisely as I say it here. I do not understand that I am saying anything about the Senator's speech that I am not warranted in saying.

Mr. HOAR. Does the Senator decline or consent to permit me to state wherein he misstates my position?

Mr. FORAKER. Well, I have such a profound respect and regard and sincere friendship for the Senator from Massachusetts that I always yield to any request he makes, but I beg the Senator from Massachusetts, if he is to interrupt me, speaking, as I am, without thought that there was to be a speech to be answered in the Senate at this time, that he will speak briefly, and let me proceed with my remarks.

Mr. HOAR. I shall be very brief.

Mr. FORAKER. I can assure the Senator that I had no thought or desire to misrepresent him. He knows that, I think.

Mr. HOAR. I can not understand the respect and regard the Senator has for me which imputes to me something which I clearly disclaimed when I spoke, and that is the kind of respect and regard my honorable friend from Ohio has for me, as is shown in what he said. I certainly have great respect for him.

I can state my point in two minutes, and anybody who doubts whether I am sincere or not, either my countrymen or my associates in the Senate, or whether I state the exact truth, will find that doubt on a belief or a disbelief of whether I state or misstate my proposition when I now reaffirm it.

I say that the President has said to the public and to the Senate that he disclaims certain conduct as unworthy of him by giving evidence to the press that the charge of it was false and by sending a message to the House of Representatives; and I called attention to the fact that the documents which he sent in failed to make that clear by not distinctly disclaiming that he had or the Administration had notice of that revolution; and that as the documents were left, it appeared that the first thing our forces had done was to prevent a lawful government from anticipating the outbreak; that I believed, from my knowledge of the character of the President, that his statement was actually true—and who does not?—and, therefore, asked him to supply the lacking

information by stating on what ground the Administration proceeded in taking steps for the restraint of Colombia. That is all.

I do not propose, after thirty-four years' service within these walls, to trouble myself to contradict again an imputation to me of any other meaning, of any indirectness or artifice on my part. If the Senator from Ohio chooses to charge me with it, of course I can not help it. He will do his duty, and I will take care of myself.

Mr. FORAKER. Mr. President, I am delighted to know that the Senator from Massachusetts is not afraid of anybody. [Laughter.]

Mr. HOAR. I said I did not think the Senator would find that anybody was afraid of him.

Mr. FORAKER. I do not know of any reason why the Senator should talk of being afraid of anybody. He made a speech, and I am undertaking to make some answer to it. I am undertaking to answer him under embarrassing circumstances and without the slightest preparation. I know nothing about the Senator's speech, except the language as I learned it from his lips as the speech fell from them. I submit to every Senator here that I have not, no matter what the Senator from Massachusetts has just now seen fit to say, misrepresented or perverted a single idea that he expressed. Certainly I have not, so far as I have understood him. A man can not make any headway in argument among intelligent men by perverting what is said by his antagonist, especially when it has been said in almost the same minute in which the answer is made.

I regret that the Senator from Massachusetts does not appreciate my respect and my esteem. But yet, Mr. President, I can not understand how anyone can escape from what I said I understood to be the effect of his speech, that from the telegrams read the Senator inferred a conclusion that was in direct contradiction of the statement of the President of the United States.

The President has stated that there was no connivance and no intrigue, and yet the Senator from Massachusetts, reading these telegrams, talks about gestation, which seems to have brought forth an idea in his mind that the President shall submit proof to him that he was telling the truth when he made the statement that he had not connived and had not intrigued. But I shall pass from that. The remarks of the Senator will be in the RECORD, and my remarks will be there precisely as I have uttered them, and Senators can judge, and all who read can judge, whether or not the Senator from Massachusetts has any cause to criticise anything I have said.

What I was proceeding to say when the Senator from Massachusetts interrupted me was this, Mr. President: That the situation in Panama was one as to which there was common knowledge to all informed newspaper-reading people throughout this country. When we ratified the treaty providing for the construction of the canal across the Isthmus and sent it to the United States of Colombia for ratification, we did that pursuant to other steps which had been previously taken. Let us recall what they were.

In the first place, Mr. President, when it was resolved that we would build an isthmian canal, negotiations were entered into not only with Colombia, but with Costa Rica and with Nicaragua. Then protocols were signed with all those countries. A protocol was signed with Colombia, one condition of which was that we should pay her \$7,000,000 if finally we determined that we would accept the Panama route. We then undertook the negotiation of a treaty with Colombia in accordance with the terms and conditions of that protocol; but when we had turned from the Nicaragua route, and had accepted the Colombia route, and had expressed our preference for it, Colombia did not seem willing to make a treaty with us in accordance with her protocol.

Instead of a cash payment of \$7,000,000, she demanded the payment of \$10,000,000 in cash. She exacted from us other terms and conditions that were severely criticised in this Chamber, but finally, after a long debate, the treaty was ratified. We sent it there. That treaty embodied every demand that Colombia had made of us, whether of money or other kind of terms and conditions. What happened? Instead of ratifying it with these increased payments and other terms and conditions that she had demanded and we had generously granted, months passed, when finally the treaty was rejected unanimously, without any consideration whatever having been given to it by the ratifying power of Colombia.

No official explanation was offered to this Government for such action. The only explanation ever given was an informal explanation given out by a distinguished citizen of Colombia, who apparently journeyed all the way from Colombia to New York to give us that information. He gave it in the shape of a newspaper interview, in which he announced that they could not agree to the treaty unless we struck out \$10,000,000 and inserted \$25,000,000.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question about that?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. FORAKER. Certainly.

Mr. MORGAN. It was with President Marroquin with whom we negotiated the treaty. That is admitted, I suppose, by everybody. Was the Congress of Colombia ever in any way consulted or committed to the Hay-Herran treaty before it was ratified by the Senate of the United States?

Mr. FORAKER. The treaty was negotiated in the ordinary way, as I understand it. I do not suppose it was submitted to them before it had been submitted to us.

Mr. MORGAN. That Congress was not even in existence at the time.

Mr. FORAKER. I understand it was not.

Mr. MORGAN. And I do not understand how the Colombian Congress by rejecting that treaty could be guilty of a breach of faith.

Mr. FORAKER. I am reciting the fact that they did reject it. I have no time in this hurried debate to go into detail and elaborate any of these matters. That is what was done.

The very moment we sent that treaty to the United States of Colombia for action there, for them to ratify it, there was evidenced a disposition unfriendly to it, a disposition that grew stronger and stronger in its manifestation, until finally the rejection came.

What did that mean to Panama? Take the map and look at it—a mere isthmus, as it is properly called. Colombia situated in South America; Panama as disconnected as a State could possibly be, both by water and by the nature of the land that intervened. To that little Department of Panama the construction of the canal at that point meant the most important advantage to her that you could possibly conceive. For that canal not to be constructed there, but to be constructed at some other place, meant the most positive disadvantage to her.

She was intensely in favor, therefore, of this canal being constructed at that place, and in favor, therefore, of the ratification of that treaty. But despite all she could do the treaty was rejected. At once it became known through the newspapers—not by any agent sent here or sent elsewhere, but as common knowledge, reported by the Associated Press and otherwise—that the people of Panama were in a state of discontent and that they would not submit to such disregard of their interests by the Government under which they were then living. It became at once known, in other words, that she was proposing to secede and set up an independent government for herself.

That was published everywhere. I read of it. I spoke about it in public speech during the campaign in Ohio. No agent came to the President of the United States. The President of the United States sent no agent to Panama. It was not necessary. Panama was acting in her own interest. She was exercising her right to object to the action of her Government, and her Government persisting in wronging her, she had a right, if she saw fit, to go into rebellion.

In other words, weeks before she declared her independence it became known that she would take that step—not officially, but it became known to every man who studied the situation and considered what human nature would do under such circumstances. The clouds were gathering. Should the United States, through its Administration at Washington, be unmindful of that fact? Not at all. It was our duty to be watchful with respect to it under any circumstances, but particularly so in view of our obligations to preserve that transit free from interruption.

Ever since 1846, when the treaty between this Government and New Granada, as that country was then called, was entered into, we have been under that obligation. Time and again we have landed our marines to preserve order and to protect that transit from interruption and embarrassment. Repeatedly we have done that at the request of Colombia; we have done it in a number of instances on our own motion. The President of the United States, seeing the storm coming, seeing the action that was threatened, remembering his obligation to preserve peace and order and protect that transit from interruption, but did his duty in taking all preliminary necessary steps to preserve order when such a contingency should arise.

Mr. President, as is suggested to me, suppose he had not done it; suppose the rebellion had come; that secession had been accomplished; that war had ensued, and all the results that accompany war had followed, what would have been the criticism then of our friends on the other side? It would have been a criticism, not that the President had acted precipitately, not that he had acted without cause, but that he had not acted at all; that he had lost the canal after the United States had expressed her preference for it, and after the people of the whole country, without regard to party and without regard to section, had demanded it.

But, Mr. President, it was in view of just such a contingency, not knowing what might happen, but to be prepared for the worst and to discharge our duty in any event, that the President took the steps indicated by the telegrams read by the Senator from Massachusetts, from which he derives such criticising conclusions.

We are given the date when the secession occurred; we are given the date when the recognition was accorded, and we are asked to believe, if we agree with the Senator from Massachusetts, that there was inordinate haste, indecent haste, in granting that recognition.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to say that I distinctly stated that I had no criticism to make on that subject, and that the time in which such a thing should be done—a little matter like that—could not be at all affected by the time we should have taken in our civil war. It was a field-mouse transaction, so far as that was concerned. I not only disclaimed what the Senator imputes to me, but I gave what I thought the strongest argument and the most apt illustration I could think of to show that so far as that was concerned there was no criticism whatever. If the Senator will read my speech in the RECORD he will find it to be so.

Mr. FORAKER. Mr. President, I am glad the Senator from Massachusetts has reconsidered, and that he has concluded to interrupt me.

Mr. HOAR. I have not reconsidered.

Mr. FORAKER. Well, the RECORD will show as to that also. Mr. President, it is true the Senator from Massachusetts said it did not matter whether it was five minutes, or five days, or five months, or some other specified time that intervened between secession and the establishment of an independent government and its recognition; but I understood the Senator—and if I misunderstood him I withdraw the statement I made a moment ago—to be arguing in that connection that there was not any necessity for haste, because it did not matter whether the recognition came five minutes afterwards, or five days afterwards, or five months afterwards, it was just as effective when it did come.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President—

Mr. FORAKER. I object to being interrupted any more.

Mr. HOAR. I think the Senator ought not to misstate my position.

Mr. FORAKER. Have I misstated again?

Mr. HOAR. I stated as distinctly and as clearly as I could put it into words the exact contrary of what the Senator has said. I said that, in my judgment, there was no criticism to be made in the matter of haste.

Mr. FORAKER. Did I not withdraw that? What is the use of arguing it again?

Mr. HOAR. The Senator said he would withdraw it, and then he added that he was glad I reconsidered my statement.

Mr. FORAKER. That was the Senator's statement, not to interrupt me again. [Laughter.]

Mr. HOAR. I did not make any such statement, Mr. President. I made no statement that I would not interrupt the Senator again.

Mr. FORAKER. Then I hope the Senator will make it now and adhere to it. [Laughter.] I am not going to misrepresent the Senator intentionally or knowingly.

Mr. HOAR. I am sure of that.

Mr. FORAKER. The Senator from Massachusetts may be certain of that.

Mr. HOAR. And therefore the Senator from Ohio will like to have me interrupt him when he misstates my position. [Laughter.]

Mr. FORAKER. Mr. President, that is the way the good nature of the Senator from Massachusetts always enables him to get the better of everybody. Yes; he may interrupt me whenever he likes. But I wish the Senator would remember when he has interrupted me to tell me before he quits where I was when he interrupted me. [Laughter.]

Mr. HOAR. I will tell the Senator where he was. He was making misstatements of my position when I interrupted him. [Laughter.]

Mr. FORAKER. That does not help me any. According to my interpretation there are so many misstatements that I am hopelessly at a loss when the Senator tells me I was discussing one of them. There are several of them I wanted to discuss. I am reminded now by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. HOPKINS] that I was speaking on the question whether or not there was any undue haste in the recognition of the Republic of Panama.

What are the facts? What are the precedents, first? In 1871, when the Republic of France was established, we recognized it immediately. We did not wait a day, or two days, nor three days, nor five days, or any other length of time. It was established one day. The date of our cablegram instructing Minister Washburne to recognize the Republic of France was dated the next day. That apparent delay of a day was only because of the difference in time. It was sent in the evening. It was already the next day

when it got here and was answered. France had no constitution, but it was not a humming bird or any other thing of a diminutive character, but a great, mighty people, forty millions or more, who had set up a Republic dedicated to freedom and to human liberty, and this great Republic at once responded with recognition.

Mr. ALDRICH. We did not even ask France, as I remember, whether the Government which had been overthrown consented.

Mr. FORAKER. No.

Now, in 1873 they established a republic in Spain. There was no delay. Immediately our minister there, General Sickles, was advised by our Government to recognize, and he did recognize, the Republic of Spain. Later, when the Emperor of Brazil was deposed, the Republic that followed him was instantly recognized, and other examples might be cited.

Mr. President, there was no reason in the case of France or Spain or Brazil for precipitate or hasty action; we had no special duties there; but in the case of the Republic of Panama it was different. What are the conditions, according to international law, that are sufficient to justify us in instantly recognizing a new government, as we did in the case of France, Spain, and Brazil?

The only condition necessary—and it does not make any difference, in the language of the Senator from Massachusetts, whether it be brought about in five minutes or five days or five months—is that the new government shall be the sole authority throughout the region over which it undertakes to govern, and that there is no contention and no disputed authority. It is not necessary to go that far. But when those conditions exist to that extent, then according to all international canons of law a recognition is in order at the option of the recognizing government. In the case of France I say there was no special necessity for haste, but these conditions existed, as we understood, and we recognized it.

It was the same as to Spain, and the same as to Brazil in a general way. But in the case of Panama it was not only true that the Republic of Panama was the only authority there of a governmental nature, that that authority was supreme throughout her borders, but it was also true that there was not even a policeman representing Colombia within the Department of Panama. They had a little army there when the trouble commenced—400 men, with some generals and colonels—and they were all quietly picked up, without the shedding of one drop of blood, and put on a transport and sent back to their own home. That completed the revolution.

But, Mr. President, there was a necessity in the case of Panama which required prompt action on our part, as there was no necessity in the other cases to which I have referred. These conditions existing, we would have been without excuse if we had halted in recognition. The necessities to which I have referred are these: Under the treaty of 1846 we had a duty at that time incumbent upon us, as it has been ever since the ratification of that treaty down to the present moment, to preserve that transit free from interruption.

War being threatened, a condition of things being threatened that promised an interruption, it was the duty of this Government to be prepared to prevent it; and instead of criticising President Roosevelt for the action he took, he ought to receive and he will receive from the American people their unqualified approbation for that which he did in this respect, because that which he did was but to redeem the promises and obligations of our Government, just as other Administrations have done the same thing over and over again.

We do not have to wait until there is actual war. We do not have to wait until there is a hostile force landed and engagements actually commence and blood is being actually shed. It is much better, Mr. President, foreseeing the situation of which all have common knowledge, to take steps to prevent these conditions that would have followed but for our intervention.

Mr. President, other nations have recognized the Republic of Panama. I do not remember how long they delayed. It was quite natural, perhaps, as the Senator from Massachusetts suggested, as I understood him, that France should promptly recognize, but I do not know of any reason why Germany should recognize or Russia should recognize or China should recognize the Republic of Panama, except only the reason that according to international law, as I have stated it, the conditions existed that warranted and justified recognition, and they recognized at their option.

Mr. President, no Senator on this side, I am sure, has the slightest objection to all possible information being given with respect to this whole transaction; no Senator on this side has the slightest objection to all the light being had on this transaction that can be shed on it, but there is a time and there is a place for Senators to discuss propositions of this character. Here in this open session is not the time nor the place. I have undertaken to say enough

only in answer to the Senator from Massachusetts to show that the President in this matter did not act hastily; that he did not act without precedent or without the warrant and authority of international law, and that he did not act contrary to, but strictly in conformity with, his official obligation, charged as he is, as the head of this nation, with the faithful execution of all our treaty obligations.

I have no hesitancy in saying, Mr. President, that I have the profound conviction that when this matter is thoroughly understood even our Democratic friends will hesitate to criticise him. Certainly they will hesitate, at any rate, when they make their nonpartisan speeches, of which we have heard so much, and then give their nonpartisan votes.

But, Mr. President, as I have already intimated, I do not want to discuss the question at any greater length than I have. I do not think it proper to do so. I have undertaken to say just enough to express the view I entertain with respect to it and the view which I believe my brother Senators entertain and the view which I believe the American people have and will approve with respect to it, and with that, for the present, I am content.

EXPOSITION AT PORTLAND, OREG.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, now, at the conclusion of this political duel, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the bill providing for the celebration of the one hundredth anniversary of the exploration of the Oregon Country.

Mr. McLAURIN. Will the Senator from Oregon yield to me for a moment, in order that I may call up a bill?

Mr. MITCHELL. I yield if it will lead to no discussion.

Mr. McLAURIN. It will lead to no discussion.

Mr. MITCHELL. Very well.

LAND TITLES IN MISSISSIPPI.

Mr. McLAURIN. I ask unanimous consent that the bill (S. 1344) to quiet certain land titles in the State of Mississippi may be now considered. It is a bill which has the unanimous approval of the Committee on Public Lands. It is a short measure, being only about twenty-five lines long.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill. It provides that in all cases in which lands in Mississippi have heretofore been sold by authority of that State, or by claim of authority of that State, and the right to make such sales was claimed to be by virtue of an act of Congress entitled "An act to enable the State of Arkansas and other States to reclaim the 'swamp lands' within their limits," the lands so sold shall be held to be of the class and kind mentioned in the act of Congress, and the sales are ratified and confirmed, and the titles to the lands are validated and vested in the purchasers.

Mr. ALLISON. I think in certain respects this is a bill of some importance, and I should like to look into it before it is passed.

Mr. McLAURIN. A similar bill passed the Senate at the last session of Congress. It passed the Committee on Public Lands of the House with an amendment, which was recommended by the land division of the Interior Department, and with that amendment the land division of the Interior Department has expressed itself as satisfied with the bill. It passed the Senate unanimously at the last session.

Mr. ALLISON. Is the amendment embodied in the bill?

Mr. McLAURIN. The House amendment is embodied in the bill.

Mr. ALLISON. I do not object to the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AIDS TO NAVIGATION AT CAPE HATTERAS, NORTH CAROLINA.

Mr. ALGER. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 2319) to provide for the construction of a light-house and fog signal at Diamond Shoal, on the coast of North Carolina, at Cape Hatteras.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. ALGER. In line 7, page 3, where evidently a mistake has been made, I move that the name be changed to "Minots Ledge" instead of "Minots Rock."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That change will be made. It is a mistake in the name.

Mr. ALLISON. I feel constrained to ask the Senator from Michigan not to press this bill to-day. I have considerable knowledge respecting it, derived from the Light-House Board. It is a very important matter. I think it will do no harm to allow it to lie over, retaining its place. I hope the Senator from Michigan will consent to that.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is made, and the bill goes over.

HARBOR OF ST. PETERSBURG, FLA.

Mr. MALLORY. Will the Senator from Oregon yield to me for a moment?

Mr. MITCHELL. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. MALLORY. I desire to call up for immediate consideration Senate concurrent resolution No. 15.

The concurrent resolution submitted by Mr. MALLORY November 18 was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to cause a survey to be made of the harbor of St. Petersburg, on Tampa Bay, in Florida, with a view to securing an adequate basin at said point for loading and unloading ocean-going vessels, with a channel 200 feet in width and 24 feet in depth from said basin to the main ship channel in Tampa Bay.

FORT HALL INDIAN RESERVATION.

Mr. DUBOIS. Will the Senator from Oregon yield to me for a moment?

Mr. MITCHELL. I yield.

Mr. DUBOIS. By the courtesy of the Senator from Oregon, I ask unanimous consent to call up the bill (S. 2823) relating to ceded lands on the Fort Hall Indian Reservation.

I will say that a similar bill has heretofore passed the Senate; that it was unanimously reported in the House, and was recommended by the Secretary of the Interior and the Commissioner of the General Land Office.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill. It provides that all lands of the former Fort Hall Indian Reservation, in the State of Idaho, within 5 miles of the boundary line of the town of Pocatello, offered for sale at public auction on and after July 17, 1902, and which remain unsold after such offering, shall be subject to entry, etc.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

THE LIGHT-HOUSE SERVICE.

Mr. NELSON. I wish the Senator from Oregon would yield to me for a moment.

Mr. MITCHELL. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. NELSON. I am directed by the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2685) to amend an act entitled "An act authorizing the construction of additional light-house districts," approved July 26, 1886, to report it. It is a very short bill, and if the Senator from Oregon has no objection I would like to have it passed.

Mr. MITCHELL. If it leads to no discussion I shall not object.

Mr. NELSON. There will be no discussion.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill. It proposes to amend section 4670 of the Revised Statutes so as to read:

SEC. 4670. The Light-House Board shall arrange the ocean, gulf, lake, and river coasts of the United States into light-house districts not exceeding eighteen in number; that any law or regulation prohibiting the employment in the light-houses of the United States of persons of more than 45 years of age be, and the same is hereby, repealed.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL EXCHANGE.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States: which was read, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith the report of the Commission on International Exchange constituted under authority of the act of March 3, 1903, in compliance with the request of the Governments of Mexico and China, for the cooperation of the United States in an effort to bring about a fixed relationship between the moneys of the gold-standard countries and the present silver-using countries.

The attention of Congress is invited to the accompanying report of the Secretary of State, whose request for an appropriation of \$100,000 for the completion of the work of the Commission in China, and other expenditures incidental to the work of the Commission, I heartily indorse.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

WHITE HOUSE, December 15, 1903.

EXPOSITION AT PORTLAND, OREG.

Mr. MITCHELL. I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the bill providing for the celebration of the one hundredth anniversary of the exploration of the Oregon country.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the bill indicated by the Senator from Oregon, which will be read by title.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 276) to provide for the celebration of the one hundredth anniversary of the exploration of the Oregon country by Capts. Meriwether Lewis and William Clark during their expedition from the Mississippi River to the Pacific Ocean

in the years 1804, 1805, and 1806; and to authorize a commission representing the United States to hold at the city of Portland, in the State of Oregon, a national, international, and oriental exhibition of arts, industries, manufactures, and the products of the rivers, soil, mine, forest, and sea in said State; and to provide and assist in the erection of a memorial building in said city of Portland, to be known as the Lewis and Clark Memorial Building; and to authorize an appropriation for all said purposes.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, during the first session of the Fifty-seventh Congress, on June 27, 1902, I had the honor of briefly addressing the Senate, when I called attention to the fact that the State of Oregon, and the people of the other Pacific States and Territories, which have been carved out of what was originally known as the "Oregon Country," were then engaged in making preparations for a national and international industrial exposition, to be held at Portland, Oreg., in the summer of 1905, in commemoration of the centennial anniversary of the crossing of the continent in that memorable and historic expedition by Captains Meriwether Lewis and William Clark, in the years 1804, 1805, and 1806.

In the remarks I then made I took occasion to say to the Senate that it was not expected that any Congressional action in recognition or aid of this enterprise would be had in that Congress, but that in the present Congress we hoped to be able to present such a state of facts, such a result of patriotic effort upon the part of the people and States of the far West and of the Pacific Northwest, as would not only elicit admiration and commendation of the people of the United States generally, but which would justify prompt and cordial recognition and liberal aid upon the part of the Congress of the United States.

It is my purpose at this time to show to the Senate, the Congress, and the country, what has already been done by the people and States of the "Oregon country," supplemented by the people of and several States never included in that country, in aid of a great national, oriental, and international industrial exposition, for the purpose and at the time and place stated.

The initiatory public act looking to the inauguration of the Lewis and Clark Centennial Industrial Exposition in 1905 was taken by the legislature of the State of Oregon in February, 1901, by the unanimous adoption by both houses of a concurrent resolution, approved by the governor on February 25, 1901.

This resolution expressed the belief that the holding of such an exposition would be of great benefit to the people of the Pacific Northwest, to the people of the General Government of the United States, and to all oriental countries, and it was therefore resolved that Congress be earnestly requested to make a suitable appropriation for a national exhibit at said fair, and also that proper acts be passed, and proper resolutions be presented to oriental countries and to other foreign governments and the Dominion of Canada, requesting them to make industrial exhibits at such fair. These resolutions further requested the Senators and Members of the House of Representatives from the State of Oregon to use every effort in their power to secure the proper legislation by Congress to carry out the spirit and intent of the resolution.

Subsequently, on October 12, 1901, a corporation was incorporated and organized under the general laws of the State of Oregon, under the name of the "Lewis and Clark Centennial and American Pacific Exposition and Oriental Fair," for the purpose of carrying on a celebration and exposition, the purpose of all of which is to be the commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the exploration of the "Oregon Country" by Captains Meriwether Lewis and William Clark, under a commission issued by Thomas Jefferson, President of the United States.

The capital stock of this corporation was fixed at \$500,000, divided into 50,000 shares of the par value of \$10 each. It was authorized to receive donations of money and of real and personal property in aid of the proposed exposition.

Up to November 1, 1903, this corporation had sold 41,510.7 shares of its capital stock, of the aggregate value of \$415,107, and is now still engaged in selling additional stock at the rate per month of about 200 shares, valued at \$2,000. In addition it has received donations amounting to \$1,800, making the total amount of money available to this corporation alone at the present time, for the purpose of the exposition, the sum of \$416,907.

LEGISLATIVE ACTION AND AID GIVEN BY DIFFERENT STATES.

Affirmative action has heretofore been taken and aid extended, as I shall show hereafter, in aid of this exposition, by the States of Oregon, California, Washington, Idaho, Utah, Montana, North Dakota, Minnesota, and Missouri.

The legislative assembly of the State of Oregon, by an act approved January 30, 1903, appropriated \$450,000 for a State exhibit at the Lewis and Clark Centennial Exposition. This money is being expended under the direction of a State commission appointed by the governor.

Of this total appropriation, \$50,000 is required by the act creating the commission to be expended in the erection of a Lewis and Clark memorial building at Portland, Oreg., provided that the said corporation shall appropriate \$50,000 for said building.

Up to November 1, 1903, the State commission had appropriated \$300,000 (exclusive of the \$50,000 set aside for the memorial building) toward the construction of buildings for the exposition. The name of the State commission and by which it is officially known is the "Lewis and Clark Centennial Exposition Commission."

The legislature of the State of California, at its session of 1903, appropriated \$20,000 for a California exhibit at the Lewis and Clark Centennial Exposition. This amount will in all probability be increased at the session of 1905, while a considerable part of the St. Louis exhibit will be transferred to Portland.

The legislature of the State of Washington, at its last session, put a clause in one of the appropriation bills appropriating, I think, \$70,000 in aid of the exposition. This bill, however, was vetoed by the governor for reasons, as I have been advised, other than opposition to the proposed exposition or to aid in its behalf, and it is confidently expected the next session of the legislature of that State will make liberal appropriations in aid of the exposition. In fact, the legislature has already provided for a Washington exhibit, but no appropriation is as yet available for the purpose. The State of Washington, it is understood, will aim to preserve the best of its St. Louis exhibit for transfer to Portland.

The legislature of the State of Idaho of 1903 appropriated \$10,000 for an Idaho exhibit at the Lewis and Clark Centennial Exposition. This amount will also doubtless be increased by the legislature of 1905. Assurances to this effect have been given, and also that the State exhibit at St. Louis will be transferred to Portland.

The legislature of the State of Utah, at its session of 1903, the present year, appropriated \$10,000 for a State exhibit at the Lewis and Clark Centennial Exposition, and assurances have been given that this amount will be increased by the next legislature.

The State of Montana, by an act approved May 27, 1903, appropriated \$60,000 for an exhibit of the State's resources at the Louisiana Purchase Exposition, and further provided in section 8 of the act as follows:

That at the close of said Louisiana Purchase Exposition the commission shall cause all exhibits which it may be permitted to control to be transferred to the city of Portland, Oreg., for the purpose of having the same exhibited at the Lewis and Clark Centennial and American Pacific Exposition and Oriental Fair to be held in that city in 1905, and for that purpose the sum of \$10,000 of the appropriation hereinbefore made shall be available. The exhibits thus transferred shall be installed and remain under the control of the commission unless otherwise provided by law.

The legislature of North Dakota of 1903 appropriated \$50,000 for a State exhibit at St. Louis and Portland, the St. Louis exhibit to be transferred to Portland.

The State of Minnesota, at the session of its legislature of 1903, appropriated \$100,000 for an exhibit at St. Louis and Portland, the St. Louis exhibit to be transferred to Portland.

While the State of Missouri, through its legislature, by section 55 of an act entitled "An act to appropriate money for the support of the State government," etc., passed by the joint assembly of that State at its session of 1903, provided as follows:

There is hereby appropriated for the years 1903 and 1904 the sum of \$10,000 to provide an exhibit of the resources of Missouri at the Lewis and Clark Centennial Exposition, to be held in Portland, Oreg., from May 1 to November 1, 1905. The money herein appropriated shall be expended under the direction of the governor of Missouri.

Thus it will be seen nine of the States of the West and Pacific Northwest and as far east as the States of Minnesota on the north, and Missouri on the south, have already indorsed the proposed exposition and extended money aid in its behalf, amounting in the aggregate to \$710,000 cash.

The total amount of money, however, made available to date, November 1, 1903, from all sources for the purposes of the Lewis and Clark Centennial Exposition is \$1,126,907, and from the following sources: From the sale of stock and donations, \$416,907; from State appropriations, State of Oregon alone, \$450,000; States other than Oregon, \$260,000; making a total, as I have stated, of \$1,126,907.

In this statement of funds available there is not included of course any estimates of revenue from admissions, concessions, or other sources, all of which will be used for exposition purposes.

PREPARATIONS FOR THE EXPOSITION.

A magnificent site has already been secured for the exposition, and great progress has been made in its preparation and in the distribution of its area.

This site is in the northwestern part of the city of Portland, Oreg., about 2 miles from the business center of the city and directly opposite the highest point reached on the Willamette River by Captain Clark in 1806. It comprises 185 acres of land and 220 acres of water (what is known as Guilds Lake). The lake is being dredged and diked, so as to give uniform depth of water and a straight alignment alongshore.

Of the land area 50 acres are to be used for buildings, 20 acres for concessions, 25 acres for a park, 5 acres for an experiment station, and the remainder for agriculture, dairy farm, stock shows, and concession purposes. The park referred to contains over 40 varieties of native trees and bushes.

The grading and landscaping have been practically completed, and the water and sewer systems are well under way. The macadamizing is finished. The estimated cost of landscaping, grading, and the water and sewer systems is \$200,000. The plan of the exposition contemplates the erection of 10 main buildings. Plans and specifications for these are now under preparation and building work will begin in early spring of 1904.

THE PROVISIONS OF THE BILL.

In pursuance of the request embodied in the legislative memorial of the State of Oregon of February 25, 1901, and of the earnest solicitation of the management, and following my own inclinations in the matter, I have presented for the consideration of the Senate and the Congress the bill now before the Senate, and I deem it appropriate and proper I should briefly explain the provisions of the measure before it is referred to the appropriate committee. The bill, as you will observe, is entitled:

A bill to provide for the celebration of the one hundredth anniversary of the exploration of the "Oregon country" by Captains Meriwether Lewis and William Clark during their expedition from the Mississippi River to the Pacific Ocean in the years 1804, 1805, and 1806; and to authorize a commission representing the United States to hold at the city of Portland, in the State of Oregon, a national, international, and oriental exhibition of arts, industries, manufactures, and the products of the rivers, soil, mine, forest, and sea in said State; and to provide and assist in the erection of a memorial building in said city of Portland, to be known as "The Lewis and Clark Memorial Building;" and to authorize an appropriation for all said purposes.

The measure recites that—

Whereas the State of Oregon has heretofore appropriated the sum of \$500,000, and the citizens of the city of Portland in said State have subscribed an additional \$400,000, and are raising an additional sum of \$100,000 to celebrate the one hundredth anniversary of the exploration of the "Oregon country" by Captains Meriwether Lewis and William Clark during their expedition from the Mississippi River to the Pacific Ocean in the years 1804, 1805, and 1806, and inasmuch as said exploration marked an epoch in the history of the United States and in the extension of its territory by prior discovery and occupation by American citizens; and

Whereas it is fit and proper that said anniversary be commemorated by an exhibition of the resources of the United States, their development, and the progress of national growth upon the Pacific coast, and, furthermore, that such exhibition should be of a national, international, and oriental character, so that not only the people of the "Oregon country" but of the United States, and of all oriental and other countries interested in the development of the commerce of the United States upon the Pacific coast and in the Pacific Ocean may participate, and should therefore have the sanction and approval of the Congress of the United States.

The bill therefore proposes to enact by section 1 that an exhibition of arts, industries, manufactures, and the products of the rivers, soil, mine, forest, and sea, as further provided, to celebrate the one hundredth anniversary of the exploration of the "Oregon country" by Captains Meriwether Lewis and William Clark during their expedition from the Mississippi River to the Pacific Ocean in the years 1804, 1805, and 1806, shall be, and the same is, by the bill authorized and required to be held at the city of Portland, in the State of Oregon, commencing May 1, 1905, and ending November 1, 1905, or, commencing June 1, 1905, and ending October 1, 1905, if said last-mentioned period shall be designated hereafter by the legislative assembly of the State of Oregon.

While by section 2 of the bill it is provided that a nonpartisan commission shall be constituted, to consist of seven commissioners, to be known and designated as the "National Lewis and Clark Centennial Exposition Commission," who shall be appointed within thirty days from the passage of the act by the President of the United States, and who shall also be subject to removal by him. Vacancies in such commission to be filled in the same manner as original appointments.

Section 3 of the bill provides that the commissioners so appointed shall be called together by the Secretary of State of the United States in the city of Portland, State of Oregon, by notice to the commissioners as soon as convenient after their appointment, but within thirty days thereafter. Such commissioners at their first meeting are to organize by the election of their officers, and they may then and there appoint such executive or other committees as may be deemed expedient, and a secretary at a salary of \$3,000 per annum, and in addition to the salary of such secretary there is allowed, out of any money appropriated by the bill, to aid in carrying forward said exposition, the sum of \$5,000 per annum, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for the purposes of defraying the clerical, office, and other necessary expenses of said commission.

It is provided by section 4 of the bill that said commission when fully organized shall appoint two of their number to act in conjunction with a like number appointed by the "Lewis and Clark Centennial and American Pacific Exposition and Oriental Fair," a corporation organized and existing under the general corporation laws of the State of Oregon and having its office and principal place of business at Portland, in said State, said two to

be chosen from the executive committee of said corporation, and a like number from the "Lewis and Clark Centennial Exposition Commission" of the State of Oregon, to constitute a board of arbitration, to whom all matters of difference arising between said national commission and said company concerning the administration and management or general supervision of said exposition shall be referred for determination; and in case of the failure of said board of arbitration to agree upon such matters as may be so referred said board of arbitration shall appoint a seventh member thereof, such seventh member, so agreed upon, to be then appointed by the Secretary of the Treasury; the decision of such board to be final in all matters presented to it for consideration and determination.

Section 5 of the bill provides that said commission be empowered to and it shall accept for the purposes of the exposition such site as may be selected and offered, at the expense of and tendered by the "Lewis and Clark Centennial and American Pacific Exposition and Oriental Fair," a corporation, as I have stated, organized and existing under the laws of the State of Oregon.

While section 6 of the bill provides that the allotment of space for the exhibitors, classification of exhibits, plan and scope of the exposition, the appointment of all judges and examiners for the exposition, and the awarding of premiums, if any, shall all be done and performed by the said corporation, the "Lewis and Clark Centennial and American Pacific Exposition and Oriental Fair."

It is further provided by section 7 that after the plans for said exposition shall be prepared by said company and approved by said commission the rules and regulations of such corporation governing the rates of entrance and admission fees, or otherwise affecting the rights, privileges, or interests of the exhibitors or of the public, shall be fixed or established by said company.

While by section 8 it is stipulated that said commission shall provide for the opening and dedication of the buildings and grounds of the Lewis and Clark Centennial and American Pacific Exposition and Oriental Fair, in said city of Portland, on the 1st day of May, 1905, or as soon thereafter as shall be practicable, with proper ceremonies; and that thereafter such exposition shall be declared open and continue open until the 1st day of November, 1905, or until the 1st day of October, 1905, if such date shall be designated by the legislative assembly of the State of Oregon as the date for the closing of the exposition.

Section 9 of the measure provides that whenever the President of the United States shall be notified by the national commission that provision has been made for grounds upon which such exposition is to be held he shall be authorized to make proclamation of same through the Department of State, setting forth the time at which such exposition will be held and the purposes thereof; that he shall communicate to the diplomatic representatives of foreign nations copies thereof, with such regulations as may be adopted by the commission for publication in their respective countries, and that he shall in behalf of the Government and the people invite foreign nations to take part in such exposition and to appoint representatives thereto.

While by section 10 it is stipulated that all articles which shall be imported from foreign countries, or shall be in the country by reason of the exposition to be held at St. Louis in the year 1904 in celebration of the anniversary of the purchase of the Louisiana territory, and upon which there shall be a tariff or customs duty, shall be admitted free of payment of duty, customs fees, or charges, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe; but that it shall be lawful at any time during the exposition to sell, for delivery at the close thereof, or to transfer from St. Louis as aforesaid for the purposes of the exposition at Portland, Oreg., any goods or property imported from and actually on exhibition in the exposition buildings at St. Louis or on the grounds thereof, or at Portland, Oreg., subject to such regulations for the security of the revenue and for the collection of import duties as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe.

It is provided, however, by this section that all such articles when sold or withdrawn for consumption in the United States shall be subject to the duty, if any, imposed upon such articles by the revenue laws in force at the date of importation, and all penalties prescribed by law shall be applied and enforced against said articles and against the person who may be guilty of any illegal sale or withdrawal.

By section 11 of the bill it is provided that such commission shall make reports monthly to the President of the United States, showing receipts and disbursements, together with a general summary of the financial condition of such exposition, and a final report within six months after the close of the exposition, presenting the results and a full exhibit thereof.

And it is further provided that said commission shall cease to exist on the 31st day of December, 1906.

All liability upon the part of the United States, except as to the amount of the appropriations made by the bill, is carefully guarded

by section 12 of the bill, which provides that the United States shall not in any manner nor under any circumstances be liable for any of the doings, acts, proceedings, or representations of the said "Lewis and Clark Centennial and American Pacific Exposition and Oriental Fair," its officers, agents, or employees, or any of them, or for the services, salaries, labor, or wages of such officers, servants, agents, or employees, or any of them, or for any subscriptions to the capital stock, or for any certificates of stock, bonds, mortgages, or obligations of any kind issued by said corporation, or for any debts, liabilities, or expenses of any kind whatsoever, attending such corporation or accruing by reason of the same.

Further provision is made by section 13 of the bill that there shall be exhibited at such exhibition, by the Government of the United States, from its Executive Departments, the Smithsonian Institution, the National Museum, and the United States Commission of Fish and Fisheries, such articles and materials as illustrate the function and administrative faculty of the Government in time of peace and its resources as a war power, tending to demonstrate the nature of our institutions and their adaptation to the wants of the people.

Furthermore, this section of the bill provides that the Bureau of American Republics shall be invited to make an exhibit, illustrating the resources and international relations of the American republics, and space in the United States Government building is to be provided for the purpose of such exhibit. And to secure a complete and harmonious arrangement of such Government exhibits, a board, to be known as the "United States Government Board," is to be created, independent of the commission provided for by this bill, to be charged with the selection, purchase, preparation, transportation, arrangement, installation, safe-keeping, exhibition, and return of such articles and materials as the heads of the several Executive Departments, the Smithsonian Institution, the Commissioner of Fish and Fisheries, and the Director of the Bureau of American Republics may, respectively, decide shall be embraced in such Government exhibit.

The bill also provides that the President may also designate additional articles for exhibition.

The board to be provided for shall be composed of one person to be named by the head of each Executive Department, one by the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, one by the Commissioner of Fish and Fisheries, and one by the Director of the Bureau of American Republics. The President is to name one of such persons so detailed as chairman, and the board itself to appoint its secretary, disbursing officer, and such other officers as it may deem necessary. The members of such board of management, with other officers and employees of the Government who may be detailed to assist them, including officers of the Army and Navy, shall receive no compensation in addition to their regular salaries, but they shall be allowed their actual and necessary traveling expenses, together with a per diem in lieu of subsistence, to be fixed by the Secretary of the Treasury, while necessarily absent from their homes and engaged upon the business of the board, while officers of the Army and Navy shall receive this allowance in lieu of the transportation and mileage now allowed by law. Any provision of law which may prohibit the detail of persons in the employ of the United States to other service than that which they customarily perform shall not apply to persons detailed for duty in connection with said Lewis and Clark Centennial and American Pacific Exposition and Oriental Fair. Employees of the board not otherwise employed by the Government shall be entitled to such compensation as the board may determine. The disbursing officer shall give a bond in the sum of \$30,000 for the faithful performance of his duties, such bond to be approved by the Secretary of the Treasury. The Secretary of the Treasury, it is provided, shall advance to such disbursing officer, from time to time, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe, a sum of money, from the appropriation proposed to be made by the bill for the Government exhibit, not exceeding at any one time the penalty of his bond, to enable him to pay the expenses of the exhibit, as authorized by the board of management created by the bill.

Section 14 of the bill provides that the Secretary of the Treasury shall be authorized and directed to place on exhibition, in connection with the exhibit from his Department, upon such grounds as shall be allotted for the purpose, one of the life-saving stations authorized to be constructed on the coast of the United States by existing law, and to cause the same to be fully equipped with apparatus, furniture, and appliances now in use in all life-saving stations of the United States.

Section 15 provides that the Secretary of the Treasury shall cause a suitable building or buildings to be erected on the sites selected by the Lewis and Clark Centennial and American Pacific Exposition and Oriental Fair for the Government exhibits as provided by the bill, and he is authorized and directed to contract therefor as soon as convenient after the passage of the bill in such

manner as he may deem expedient, but the contracts for such building or buildings shall not exceed the sum of \$250,000, which sum, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is by this section of the bill appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated to defray the expenses of erecting such Government building or buildings thus authorized.

The bill further provides that the Secretary of the Treasury shall cause such building or buildings to be constructed from plans to be approved by said Government board, and he is authorized and required to dispose of such building or buildings, or the material composing the same, at the close of the exposition, giving preference to the city of Portland or to the said Lewis and Clark Centennial and American Pacific Exposition and Oriental Fair to purchase the same at an appraised value, to be ascertained in such manner as he may determine.

Section 16 of the bill provides that said commission shall be authorized and required to accept and receive from the Lewis and Clark Centennial and American Pacific Exposition and Oriental Fair the site in the city of Portland, upon which there shall be erected a building, to be known as the "Lewis and Clark Memorial Building," which said building and site shall be conveyed, donated, or dedicated to the State of Oregon, to be held in trust for all the people of said State and the nation for the following purposes: For the purpose of receiving and safely keeping therein the official records, archives, exhibits, literature, collections, and property of the Oregon Historical Society and under the control of said society, and for the purpose of receiving and safely keeping therein statues, works of art, publications, maps, charts, or other property that may be given, donated, devised, or granted to the State of Oregon in trust, as aforesaid, or authorized by the United States or any Territory thereof, or any foreign country, and for the purpose of receiving and safely keeping therein any works of art, library, or property that may be given, donated, granted, or bequeathed to the State of Oregon in trust, as aforesaid, by any person whatsoever, and for the purpose of receiving and safely keeping therein valuable paintings, works of art, or other property that may be loaned, donated, granted, or bequeathed to the State of Oregon in trust for the adornment of said building or the education of the people. And this memorial building is also to be in part a museum, devoted thereafter to history, literature, arts, sciences, and particularly as a repository of the history of the "Oregon Country," and is to be a memorial building in commemoration of the exploration of the "Oregon Country" by Captains Meriwether Lewis and William Clark during their expedition from the Mississippi River to the Pacific Ocean in the years 1804, 1805, and 1806, and in and about which building shall be placed by the United States, acting by and through said commission, suitable and appropriate statues, of bronze, marble, or other material, of Thomas Jefferson, Captains Meriwether Lewis and William Clark, and Thomas H. Benton and Lewis F. Linn, former Senators from the State of Missouri; also that of Robert Gray, the American navigator and discoverer of the Columbia River; John Jacob Astor, the American fur trader in the "Oregon Country," and such other great historic figures as have been connected with the acquisition and settlement of the "Oregon Country" as a part of the United States as may be designated by said commission, and such other works of art, manufactures, maps, charts, and publications as may from time to time be authorized or published by the United States.

This section provides further that plans and specifications for said memorial building shall be prepared by the Lewis and Clark Centennial and American Pacific Exposition and Oriental Fair; and there is by this section of the bill appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to assist in the erection of said building, the sum of \$250,000; and to provide for said statues and other works of art and the contents of said building a further sum is proposed to be appropriated by this section of the bill of \$100,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

The bill provides, as a condition to the appropriations provided for by this section, that the Lewis and Clark Centennial and American Pacific Exposition and Oriental Fair shall set apart, to be used in the construction of said building, the sum of \$50,000, and that the State of Oregon, acting by and through the Lewis and Clark Centennial Exposition Commission, shall have made available the appropriation toward the construction of said building in the sum of \$50,000, as authorized by the act of the legislative assembly of the State of Oregon, approved January 30, 1903, it being the intention, as declared by the bill, that the appropriation authorized by Congress by this section shall be available whenever and as soon as said commission shall have been satisfied that the sum of \$100,000, whether appropriated by the Lewis and Clark Centennial and American Pacific Exposition and Oriental Fair, or by the Lewis and Clark Centennial Exposition Commission, of Portland, Oreg., or both, has been used, or has been set aside to be used in the construction of such building; said

sum so proposed to be appropriated by this section of the bill to be available upon the order of the commission, payable as other sums are authorized to be paid by this proposed act.

It is provided, further, by this section that if said building shall not be completed on or before December 31, 1906, then the same shall be carried on to completion under the direction and supervision of the Secretary of the Treasury.

It is provided by section 17 of the bill that the commissioners to be appointed by the President under this proposed act shall receive as compensation for their services and expenses the sum of \$4,000 each per annum, the same to be paid by the Secretary of the Treasury, and deducted from any money appropriated by the bill for said exposition.

While section 18 provides that no member of said commission or of said Government board, whether an officer or otherwise, shall be personally liable for any debt or any obligation which may be created or incurred by said commission or by the United States Government board authorized by the bill.

Section 19 of the bill recites in the nature of a whereas that inasmuch as the State of Oregon has appropriated the sum of \$500,000 to assist in holding said exposition, and the Lewis and Clark Centennial and American Pacific Exposition and Oriental Fair has created a fund of \$400,000, with an additional fund to be raised of \$100,000, to assist in holding said exposition, aggregating \$1,000,000 raised by the people of the State of Oregon toward the celebration of this epoch in American history, and inasmuch as States and Territories of the United States and several foreign countries have already signified their intention to participate in said exposition, and have appropriated large sums of money to assist in holding the same, therefore it is provided by this section of the bill, that there shall be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$1,500,000, in addition to the sums thereinbefore proposed to be appropriated by the bill, to aid in carrying forward said exposition, to pay the salaries of the members and secretary of the commission by the bill authorized, and such other necessary expenses as may be incurred by said commission in the discharge of its duties in connection with said exposition, and to discharge all such other obligations incurred by the Government on account of said exposition, except for the erection of its own buildings and the making and care of its own exhibits at said exposition, and excepting also the sum proposed to be appropriated for the erection of the Lewis and Clark memorial building and to provide the contents thereof, as authorized by other sections of the bill.

This section further provides that the money thus appropriated shall be disbursed under the direction of the Lewis and Clark Centennial and American Pacific Exposition and Oriental Fair, under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury and upon vouchers to be approved by such commission, acting by and through its president and secretary.

While by section 20 it is made the especial duty of said national commission to provide a full and complete exhibition at said exposition of the arts, industries, manufactures, and products of the soil, mines, forest, and other resources of the Territory of Alaska, the Hawaiian Islands, the Philippine Islands, and the oriental countries, and to illustrate the commerce of the Pacific Ocean; and to that end the President of the United States is authorized to designate any consul, vice-consul, or officer of the military or naval service of the United States to assist said commission in the collection of said exhibits.

By section 21 the Secretary of War is authorized, at his discretion, to detail for special duty in connection with the Lewis and Clark Centennial and American Pacific Exposition and Oriental Fair such officers of the Army as may be required, to report to the general commanding the Department of the Columbia; and the officers thus detailed shall not be subject to loss of pay or rank on account of such detail, nor shall any officer or employee of the United States receive additional pay or compensation because of his services connected with such exposition from the United States or from such exposition.

Section 22 of the bill proposes to appropriate the sum of \$25,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to defray the expenses of an exhibition of the Indian industrial schools of the United States, to be placed in charge and under the control of the officers in charge of the Chemawa Indian Training School, near Salem, Oreg., and to be expended at the exposition by such officials, under the direction of said commission, so as to illustrate the work of the Government of the United States in this field; and such officials are authorized and required by the bill to make a special effort to represent therein the Indian tribes of the United States, and particularly to represent the Indian tribes of the "Oregon Country," their relics, memorials, customs, religions, numbers, and history.

It is provided by section 23 that nothing shall be so construed in the bill as to create any liability of the United States, direct or indirect, for any debt or obligation incurred, or for any claim for

aid or pecuniary assistance from Congress or the Treasury of the United States in support or liquidation of any debts or obligations created by said commission.

Section 24 provides that medals with appropriate devices, emblems, and inscriptions commemorative of the Lewis and Clark Exposition, and of the awards to be made to exhibitors thereat, shall be prepared at some mint of the United States for the board of directors of the Lewis and Clark Centennial and American Pacific Exposition and Oriental Fair, a corporation; and in addition thereto such numbers of what is commonly called the "Jefferson medal," the same to be in facsimile of the medals bearing the medallion portrait of Thomas Jefferson, President of the United States, distributed among the Indian tribes by Captains Meriwether Lewis and William Clark in their expedition from the Mississippi River to the Pacific Ocean, as the board of directors of the Lewis and Clark Centennial and American Pacific Exposition and Oriental Fair may deem advisable, shall in like manner be prepared at some mint of the United States, for the board of directors thereof, the same to be distributed by sale or otherwise by such board of directors, in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the exploration of the "Oregon Country" by Captains Meriwether Lewis and William Clark; and also facsimiles of the "beaver money of Oregon Territory" shall in like manner be prepared at some mint of the United States for the board of directors of the association, for distribution, by sale or otherwise, by said board of directors, which said "beaver money" was authorized to be coined by the provisional government of Oregon by an act of the legislature thereof of February 16, 1849 (all subject, nevertheless, to the provisions of the twenty-seventh section of the coinage act of 1893), and upon payment of a sum not less than the actual cost thereof; and all provisions, whether penal or otherwise, of said coinage act against counterfeiting or imitating of coins of the United States are made to apply to the medals struck and issued under this bill.

It is further and finally provided in the bill that the total appropriations provided for by the bill of \$3,125,000 shall take effect and become available immediately upon the passage of the act.

A final provision of the bill is to the effect that the Postmaster-General of the United States shall be authorized and directed, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to grant to the commission to be created by this bill, and to the president, secretary, and director-general of the Lewis and Clark Centennial and American Pacific Exposition and Oriental Fair, a corporation, and to said corporation, and to the president and secretary of the Lewis and Clark Centennial Exposition Commission of the State of Oregon, the franking privilege, by means of which the free use of the United States mails, until December 31, 1906, shall be enjoyed by said commission, president, secretary, director-general, and corporation aforesaid.

DO NATIONAL INTEREST AND PATRIOTISM AND THE GENERAL WELFARE JUSTIFY THE PROPOSED LEGISLATION?

Such, Mr. President, are the provisions and extent of the bill submitted for the consideration of the American Congress.

In this connection the inquiry naturally suggests itself, Is the enterprise in whose interest the bill is drawn, and for the promotion of which the appropriation is asked, of such a national character as to justify the proposed legislation? Is the enterprise one which justly and properly appeals to national pride and the patriotism of the American people? Is it one which, if consummated, will be not only a fitting monument to the foundation builders of one of the grandest epochs in American history, but which will at the same time be an industrial exposition of arts, industries, manufactures, and of the manifold products of the rivers, soil, mines, forests, and sea of the far West, and of the great Pacific Northwest, which will give a tremendous impetus to the development and extension of the commerce of the Pacific Ocean and of oriental trade?

In answer to these inquiries it is respectfully and confidently suggested that no other historical event in our national existence of an individual nature has done so much toward the development of American occupation and settlement, American commerce, domestic and foreign, and American civilization as has the geographic, scientific, and military expedition across the then trackless American continent by Captains Meriwether Lewis and William Clark one hundred years ago. In fact, since the beginning of time history fails to record any geographic and scientific exploration into the solitudes and dangers of an unexplored wilderness, and having for its purpose the reclamation from the dominion of the barbarian more than one-half of a desolate continent and savage empire, and the extension of the dominion of civilization, comparable with that planned by the immortal Jefferson and so successfully executed by his courageous and intrepid military officers, Lewis and Clark.

Indeed, so faithfully and successfully did these chosen military agents execute the dangerous and herculean task imposed upon

them that on its consummation President Jefferson made the following declaration:

Never did a similar event excite more joy throughout the United States. The humblest of its citizens have taken a lively interest in the issue of this journey and looked with impatience for the information it would furnish. Nothing short of the official journals of this extraordinary and interesting journey will exhibit the importance of the service—the courage, devotion, zeal, and perseverance, under circumstances calculated to discourage, which animated this little band of heroes throughout the long, dangerous, and tedious travel.

The character of this expedition and the mighty consequences flowing from it were clearly and succinctly stated by President Roosevelt in a speech at Portland, Oreg., on the 21st day of May last, when, during his visit to that city, he laid the corner stone, in its beautiful park, of a monument the people of Oregon are erecting there in commemoration of the great historic achievement of Lewis and Clark. Among other things, President Roosevelt said:

We come here to-day to lay a corner stone that is to call to mind the greatest single pioneering feat on this continent—the voyage of Lewis and Clark—which rounded out the ripe statesmanship of Jefferson and his followers by giving to the United States all of the domain between the Mississippi and the Pacific.

The sailing of Columbus, with his three galleys and ninety men, from the port of Palos, in Spain, four hundred and eleven years ago on the 3d day of August last, in search of a new world, was an undertaking scarcely more courageous, venturesome, and daring, or threatened with greater possible hardships and dangers, than was the starting from the Missouri River of Lewis and Clark and their small band of associates on May 14, 1804, on their perilous expedition across the continent.

The one expedition sought and found a new world—a then hitherto unknown continent and adjacent islands, while the other had for its purpose the reclamation of one-half of the continent thus discovered by Columbus from a state of deep isolation and dark barbarism, and its conversion to a high state of civilization. Each was a mighty undertaking. Each was menaced by manifold unseen dangers. Each was planned by a prescience, genius, and courage seldom possessed by man or exemplified by human action. Each marked the beginning of a series of events incomparable in importance and in the character and magnitude of their results. Each was the initiatory step in an epoch pregnant with consequences of the most gigantic and far-reaching character. Each was the beginning of a cycle that has but few, if any, parallels in the world's history of physical development and human progress. Each marked the beginning of an era—the one in the history of the world's development, the other in that of America, incomparable in character, unparalleled in fruitful results, and inestimable in its value in the promotion of the general welfare and progress of the human race.

The conspicuous part taken by Thomas Jefferson in the purchase of the Louisiana Territory from France in 1803, and in inaugurating about the same time and subsequently carrying to successful completion the Lewis and Clark expedition, is in and of itself enough to keep the name of Thomas Jefferson among the immortals, enduring as the sun, and fadeless as the stars. To the author of the Declaration of Independence and the founder of the University of Virginia the present generation and all the unborn generations of America owe a debt of lasting gratitude, of momentous magnitude, and which can never be fully liquidated. And no less does this demand on a nation's and a people's gratitude result from the part he took in the purchase of Louisiana Territory and in the Lewis and Clark expedition than from the fact that he was the author of the Declaration of Independence and the founder of the University of Virginia.

While it is the intention of the management of the proposed Lewis and Clark Exposition—which, by the way, is in the hands and under the control of a large corps of able, energetic, wide-awake, successful business men of the Pacific coast States—to have not only a national but an oriental and international exposition that will demand the attention and admiration and receive the consideration and generous support, not only of the people and governments of the Orient, but of the people and governments of Europe, it is not expected it will be on the grand or extensive and expensive scale of the Louisiana Purchase Exposition. That exposition, it is now conceded by all, will undoubtedly be the most elaborate and magnificent national and international industrial exposition the world has ever seen. But if the United States can properly and appropriately contribute, as it has already done to the success of this grand universal exposition at St. Louis, the sum of \$6,478,000 in honor of the Louisiana Purchase, then the great empire of the Far West—the people of the Pacific States and of the great Pacific Northwest feel warranted in expressing the belief that they are entitled to a fraction less than one-third of that amount in aid of an exposition that will exhibit not only to the people of this country, but European and oriental countries, the wonderful products of a land which one hundred years ago was a territory incognito—the uninhabited, unsettled "Oregon

Country"—and all in commemoration of the marvelous achievement of Lewis and Clark, by whose daring and courageous enterprise this great domain was rescued from barbarism, saved to this country, and brought within the pale of a high state of physical development, human progress, and advanced civilization.

APPROPRIATIONS HERETOFORE MADE IN AID OF THE LOUISIANA PURCHASE EXPOSITION AT ST. LOUIS, MO.

The total appropriations to date in the interest of the Louisiana Purchase Exposition, at St. Louis, Mo., amount to \$6,478,000. The sum is made up of the following items:

Expenses of the Louisiana Purchase Commission, act of June 6, 1900.	\$10,000
Aid to Louisiana Purchase Exposition, St. Louis, Mo., act March 3, 1901.	5,000,000
Buildings, by same act.	250,000
Government exhibit, act June 28, 1902.	800,000
Life-saving exhibit, act June 28, 1902.	8,000
Buildings, act June 28, 1902.	200,000
Indian exhibit, act June 28, 1902.	40,000
Agricultural exhibit, act March 3, 1903.	100,000
Alaska exhibit, act March 3, 1903.	50,000
Indian Territory exhibit, act March 3, 1903.	25,000
Expenses Senate committee, dedication of Louisiana Purchase Exposition.	2,000
Expenses House committee, dedication of Louisiana Purchase Exposition.	8,000
Total, as above.	6,478,000

In this connection let it be borne in mind that in comparison with other sections of the country, East, Central, North, and South, the great West and the Pacific Northwest have not had much encouragement or aid from the General Government—none in fact in the way of aid to any industrial exposition.

THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE "OREGON COUNTRY" TO THE NATIONAL TREASURY.

It is both interesting and instructive to consider the vast money contributions made to the National Treasury by the "Oregon Country" in the last fifty-two years, commencing with the year 1851 and counting to the present date.

The total customs receipts from Oregon alone for the years 1851-1903 was \$13,715,043.12; from the territory included in the State of Washington, \$6,015,362.71; and from that included in the State of Idaho, \$627,098.17; making the total of customs receipts alone in the last fifty-two years from the "Oregon Country," not including contributions from those portions of the States of Montana and Wyoming which were originally parts of the "Oregon Country," 1851-1903, inclusive, \$20,357,504; while the total internal-revenue receipts from the "Oregon Country" for the fiscal years 1863-1903, inclusive, covering the last forty years, was \$14,255,809.23; thus making a grand total from customs and internal-revenue receipts paid into the Treasury by the "Oregon Country" in the last fifty-two years, to say nothing of the large amounts paid in prior to that date, of \$34,613,313.23; while the amount of cash received from the sale of public lands in the "Oregon Country" for the fiscal years 1854-1903, inclusive, amounted to \$20,255,744.37, making a grand total of \$54,869,057.70, all within a fraction of less than one-half of a century.

A balancing of the books, as will be presently seen, will show at a glance that the money contributions made to the General Government and the United States Treasury by the "Oregon Country" are many millions of dollars in excess of the expenditures on the part of the Government for development, improvement, and maintenance in such territory, including appropriations for rivers and harbors, the construction and repair of public buildings, for the establishment of light-houses, revenue vessels, and other aids to commerce, surveys of the public lands, for maintenance of the Federal courts, and the Indian service, including salaries of all Federal officials. A careful estimate will show that the contributions exceed the expenditures in the sum of about \$37,000,000.

Notwithstanding these large contributions to the Treasury of the United States by the "Oregon Country," and notwithstanding the fact of the great number of important rivers and harbors located within the "Oregon Country," all in need of improvement by the National Government, there have been expended all told for rivers and harbors in that area since the beginning of the Government to the present time but \$13,181,731.55, while the total amount expended in the balance of the area of the United States, since the beginning of the Government, for the improvement of rivers and harbors is \$388,878,602.98.

While the amount expended by the National Government during the same time in the "Oregon Country" in the erection and improvement of public buildings was but \$2,344,794.90; for the construction of light-houses and other aids to commerce, but \$1,603,596.20; and for surveys of public lands, but \$2,177,830.82.

The statement, therefore, that the great West, formerly known as the "Oregon Country," has not received that national recognition to which it is justly entitled, especially in view of the fact of its large contributions to the National Treasury, can hardly be questioned.

THE "OREGON COUNTRY" HAS CONTRIBUTED \$125,979,918.23 TO THE WEALTH OF THE NATION IN PRECIOUS METALS ALONE.

But in addition to this the fact must not be lost sight of that the "Oregon Country" has, since its first settlement, contributed to the wealth of the nation, from the bowels of the earth, in the output of the precious metals, gold and silver, as follows:

That portion of the "Oregon Country" now included in the State of Oregon alone has contributed \$27,465,639.47 in gold and \$191,080.18 in silver; that portion now included in the State of Washington has contributed \$3,217,781.19 in gold and \$46,558.79 in silver; that portion included in the State of Idaho has contributed \$42,161,108 in gold and \$2,087,750.67 in silver; that portion of Montana formerly a part of "Oregon Country" has contributed approximately \$40,000,000 in gold and \$11,000,000 in silver, while that portion of Wyoming which formerly was a part of the "Oregon Country" has contributed approximately \$800,000 in gold and \$10,000 in silver, making a total contribution to the wealth of the nation in the precious metals since the beginning of the Government from the "Oregon Country," in gold, of \$112,644,528.66 and \$13,335,389.57 in silver, or a total of \$125,979,918.23 in precious metals alone.

That the amounts shown by these statistics, which are taken from the Mint reports, are less to the extent of many millions of dollars than the actual output of the precious metals in that Territory, I think will be conceded by all familiar with the history of the mining industries of the Pacific coast.

Based upon these considerations, therefore, we feel justified in confidently appealing to the representatives of other sections of the country to aid in the manner and to the extent of the pending bill in a great national and international enterprise which it is believed will be of incalculable interest and benefit, not alone to the people of the "Oregon Country" but to the people of every section of the United States.

THE EXALTED PURPOSES OF THE LEWIS AND CLARK EXPOSITION.

But the proposed exposition is not intended merely as a glorification over the progress that has been made in the physical development of the "Oregon Country," or of hilarious exaltation over the manifold and immensely valuable products of field, and mine, and forest, and river of the "Oregon Country," but above and beyond all this it must not be forgotten that the successful expedition of Lewis and Clark was the solving of a mighty geographical, political, and commercial problem which gave to this country and the people of this country an outlet to the Pacific Ocean, and the trade and commerce of the world; thus making it possible for the present and all future generations to realize and enjoy the political, social, religious, educational, and commercial advantages and blessings which flow from the very highest order of modern uncircumscribed civilization.

But not this alone. The planting and development in that vast region of ethical, social, educational, and religious germs, the door for all of which was opened by the grand expeditionary enterprise of Lewis and Clark, was a work of momentous character and of great national utility, whose authors are deserving of national homage and their acts of national commemoration.

THE GEOGRAPHICAL EXTENT, AND TITLE OF THE UNITED STATES TO THE "OREGON COUNTRY."

The history of the manner in which the territory formerly known as the "Oregon Country" became a part of the public domain of the United States, and the nature of the title under which we hold, its extent territorially, and its general characteristics, are all matters of the highest interest. Although the present State of Oregon includes within its boundaries an area of more than 30,000 square miles more than that included in the whole of the six New England States, it is but a fraction less than one-fifth in size of the original "Oregon Country" as claimed first by Spain, and subsequently by the United States. Something of its magnitude and territorial extent can be realized when it is remembered that after losing about 200,000 square miles by unprofitable and unwise compromise 285,123 square miles remained, and out of which three great States, and large portions of two others—namely, Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and parts of Montana and Wyoming—have been carved.

The history of the various titles under which our Government asserted title to this vast domain in the prolonged diplomatic contest with Great Britain for the supremacy is highly interesting. Our title was of a triple character:

First. Discovery and settlement by Spain, to which title we succeeded;

Second. Discovery in our own right in 1792, followed by the scientific exploration of Lewis and Clark, and subsequently by actual settlement; and

Third. Cession from France of the Louisiana territory.

The Lewis and Clark scientific exploration was one of the first steps following discovery by Captain Gray looking to its reclamation and settlement, and which was followed by the two Winship brothers, of Boston, who made the first attempted settlement on

the Columbia River after Gray's discovery. They sailed from Boston in 1809 in two ships, the *O'Kaine*, of which Jonathan was captain, and the *Albatross*, of which Nathan was master. The *O'Kaine* went direct to California, while the *Albatross* went to the Sandwich Islands and thence to the Columbia River, arriving there with 50 men on board early in the spring of 1810. The vessel proceeded up the river a distance of 40 miles, opposite the place now known as "Oak Point," where they disembarked, cleared a small tract of land, erected a building, and planted vegetables, all of which, however, were demolished and swept away by the June floods of the same year, when Captain Nathan Winship embarked with his men, joined his brother in California, and, learning of Astor's expedition, never returned.

This was followed by the establishment of the town of Astoria by John Jacob Astor in 1811. The war of 1812 coming on, the English captured Astoria, hauled down the American flag, and hoisted the English ensign, and changed the name of the fort from Fort Astor to Fort George; but at the close of the war in 1818 it was restored to the United States by the treaty, which stipulated the restoration of "all territory, places, and possessions whatsoever taken by either party from the other during the war." In this restoration the English denominated it "the settlement." However many may have been the occupants of this country, or those employed by the Hudson Bay Company prior to that, this was unquestionably the first permanent settlement made by white men in the valley of the Columbia or in the territory of Oregon, and this was by American citizens. The claim, therefore, to rightful settlement of the "Oregon Country," now comprising the whole of the States of Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and parts of Montana and Wyoming, can rightfully attach only to the United States.

The Lewis and Clark scientific exploration, therefore, and the acts of settlement which followed constitute one of the highest, if, indeed, not the very highest, element of the second claim to title to that country made by our Government in its prolonged diplomatic controversy with Great Britain, namely, that of "discovery in our own right in 1792, followed by scientific exploration and actual settlement."

In connection, however, with the proposed centennial exposition and the passing of the continent by the great explorers, Lewis and Clark, it is interesting to note briefly the respective claims made by the different governments to the "Oregon Country," and also to call attention to the character of the diplomatic controversies by which these several claims were finally disposed of and settled.

It is a matter of history that for nearly three centuries prior to 1790 Spain had been making claim, on account of alleged discovery, to all of the Oregon territory, extending from the forty-second degree of north latitude, not only to 54° 40', but to the sixty-first parallel, and extending from the Pacific Ocean eastward to the central heights of the Rocky Mountains. It was in dimensions a vast empire. Its geographic extent was about 760 miles from north to south and about 650 miles from east to west, embracing an area of about 494,000 square miles, or seven and one-half times greater than all of the New England States put together, two and one-half times as large as the whole of Spain, and more than 50,000 square miles more than all of Spain, France, and Portugal combined.

This claim of Spain dated back two hundred and seventy-seven years prior to 1790, or about three hundred and ninety years ago, the inceptive right being based by some on the alleged discovery of the Pacific Ocean by Balboa in 1513, when he assumed possession of it as a private sea in the name and for the benefit of the Spanish Crown. But this claim had slight ground; indeed, no really good ground of support, though it was somewhat strengthened from time to time by the navigation of its coasts and the occupation of its territory by the Spanish navigators, Maldonado in 1528 and Farrello in 1543. In 1592 San Juan de Fuca, a Greek navigator in the Spanish service, entered the strait bearing his name, which now separates the United States from the British possessions. He then for the time supposed he had discovered the great northwestern passage connecting the two oceans. In 1774 the navigator, Juan Peres, sailed from San Blas January 25, landing first on the northeastern coast of Queen Charlotte Island, near the fifty-fourth parallel. Humboldt says he was the first of all the European navigators to anchor in Nootka Sound, in latitude 49° 30'. This he named Port San Lorenzo. Four years later it was by Captain Cook called King George's Sound. Heceta, the Spanish navigator, visited the coast in 1775, and Galiano and Valdes in 1792; that they explored the entire Oregon coast and even farther northward is an historical fact which can not be questioned.

Prior to 1790 the vague claim of Spain to this vast territory was not seriously disputed by any power, although Great Britain had been feebly making a claim scarcely less ancient, though based on a more fragile and less defensible title. This claim on the part of

Great Britain rested originally (although subsequently that source of title was virtually abandoned) on the acts, familiar to all, of Sir Francis Drake, the English buccaneer and filibusterer, who in 1577 with five armed vessels had sailed from England, with the connivance of Queen Elizabeth, ostensibly for a voyage to Egypt, but in fact on a filibustering expedition against Spain. Two years later, in 1579, having reached the waters of the Pacific Ocean through the Straits of Magellan, his fleet encountered storms, reducing it to one schooner of 100 tons burden and his naval force to sixty men. Just how far Drake sailed northward along the California and Oregon coasts is a matter of doubt, some historians asserting he went as far as 42°, others 43°, and some say as far as 48°. All agree, however, that having encountered storms, he returned to the thirty-eighth parallel and landed in a bay, now supposed to be either the present bay of San Francisco or the Bay of Bodega, where, as one historian tells us, he accepted from the savages of the far West, in the name of Queen Elizabeth, "coronation, scepter, and sovereignty." Great Britain, however, in her prolonged contest with the United States placed no reliance on the acts of Drake, but based her claim on the right of discovery of the "Oregon Territory" by Captain Cook in 1778, and subsequently on alleged discoveries by Captain Mears in 1788, and by Captain Vancouver in 1792, 1793, and 1794.

It was claimed, moreover, that Great Britain was the first to acquire what was termed a "beneficial interest in those regions by commercial intercourse."

Resting on these respective titles—that of Great Britain certainly lacking in every respect all those essential elements which constitute a real foundation for a valid claim of sovereignty—these two great rival powers, Spain and Great Britain, came into contention over their respective claims to and in this vast territory in 1790, resulting in what is known in history as "The Nootka Convention." The claim of England was then hardly one of sovereignty, but rather, as she asserted, "an indisputable right to the enjoyment of a free and uninterrupted navigation, commerce, and fishing and to the possession of such establishments as they should form, with the consent of the natives of the country, not previously occupied by any European nations."

In the assertion of these alleged rights on the part of Great Britain and the Spanish contention on the part of the Spanish Crown the conflicting and rival claims to sovereignty were attempted to be upheld, as one historian tells us, "by an occasional visit by vessels, temporarily trading with the natives, some fishing, and a few shanties." The Spanish authorities, denying the rights asserted by Great Britain, seized and confiscated her vessels and other property employed in the assertion of her claims to occupation, if not indeed to sovereignty. It was this conflict which resulted in the "Nootka Convention of 1790."

That Great Britain gained nothing by that treaty in respect of her alleged rights as to sovereignty, tenancy, or commerce in any of the countries bordering on the Pacific Ocean is conceded by all historians. That her claims, both as to discovery and prior occupation, submitted to that convention were absolutely baseless as against those of Spain or any other power must be conceded. Even should we concede all that has ever been claimed by the most ardent historian in respect to the achievements of Sir Francis Drake and others, it amounts to nothing as against the Spanish claim; and so in reference to the alleged discovery by the British captains, Cook, Mears, and Vancouver, for the evidence is conclusive that this same coast had been navigated and the land discovered more than two hundred and sixty years before by the Spanish navigator Maldonado in 1528. If, then, Great Britain gained nothing in her claim either as to sovereignty or occupancy by the "Nootka Treaty" of 1790, as she clearly did not, she certainly had no right to complain.

When this treaty was submitted to the British Parliament, it was denounced by the opposition as a cowardly surrender. Sir Charles Fox said:

Nothing has been gained, but, on the contrary, much has been surrendered.

And speaking further, Mr. Fox said:

Our right before the convention, whether admitted or denied by Spain, was of no consequence, was to settle any part of South or Northwestern America not fortified against us by previous occupancy, and we are now restricted to settle in certain places only and under certain conditions. Our rights of fishing extended to the whole ocean, and now it is limited and not to be exercised within certain distances of Spanish settlements. Our right of making settlements was not as now a right to build huts, but to plant colonies if we thought proper. In renouncing all right to make settlements in South America we have given to Spain what she considered as inestimable and have in return been contented with dust.

But whatever rights Great Britain had by virtue of the "Nootka treaty" of 1790 were lost and totally destroyed when in 1796 Spain declared war against Great Britain, as it is a principle of public law that a declaration of war destroys all treaties between the belligerents.

The claim of Spain to all of the Oregon territory south of the sixty-first parallel was acknowledged by the Russian Government, the only power holding claims of any value which conflicted with

Spain. In 1790 complaints had been made to the Russian court against Russian subjects for invading Spanish territory south of 61° of north latitude. To this complaint the Emperor of all the Russias, through the proper channels, replied in the following words:

The Emperor assures the King of Spain he is extremely sorry that the repeated orders issued to prevent subjects of Russia from violating in the smallest degree the territory belonging to another power should have been disobeyed.

This was a clear and unequivocal recognition of the sovereignty of Spain to all territory south of the sixty-first parallel.

The contention on the part of Great Britain that whatever rights the United States acquired in the Oregon territory in virtue of the treaty with Spain, known as the "Florida treaty" of 1819, were subject to certain rights of Great Britain as to alleged joint occupancy with Spanish subjects, existing in virtue of the "Nootka" treaty of 1790, was completely annihilated, first by Secretary Calhoun in 1843 and subsequently by Secretary Buchanan in 1845. They clearly demonstrated two propositions: First, that not only had Great Britain acquired no rights of sovereignty in virtue of the treaty of 1790 with Spain, but by that treaty the sovereignty of Spain was directly conceded; for the only rights fully recognized to Great Britain in that treaty were that her subjects should not be disturbed in landing on the coasts in places already occupied for the purpose of carrying on trade with the natives. Second, that the treaty of 1790 was abrogated by the declaration of war by Spain against Great Britain in 1796; that by that war it fell to the ground and was never resurrected, and therefore every right which Great Britain had in virtue of its provisions vanished. In their discussion the principle of public law that war terminates all subsisting treaties between the belligerent powers was discussed with great ability. It was clearly shown that the only exception to this general rule is in cases of a treaty recognizing certain sovereign rights as belonging to a nation which had previously existed independently of any treaty engagement—that is to say, those rights which the treaty did not create, but simply recognized, can not be destroyed by war between the governments constituting parties to the treaties.

The treaty of peace, for instance, between this country and Great Britain of 1783, wherein Great Britain acknowledged that the United States was "free, sovereign, and independent" is of this exceptional character—a right recognized, but not granted by treaty, and hence a right which can not be destroyed by war.

The claim of Spain to the "Oregon Country," that is, the territory lying on the Pacific Ocean north of the forty-second parallel, and extending to 54° 40', did not rest alone on discovery and settlement, but also as being embraced in and a part of the ancient Louisiana, ceded by France to Spain in 1763, and by a secret arrangement receded to France in 1800, then ceded by France again to the United States in 1803, known as the "Louisiana Purchase."

Whatever claim, therefore, Spain had to the "Oregon country" in 1800, prior to her cession to France, in virtue either of discovery and settlement on the one hand, or by cession from France as a part of the ancient Louisiana on the other, vested in the United States by the Louisiana purchase. That Spain, therefore, was the real and sole sovereign owner of the whole of Oregon Territory as against Great Britain there can be no doubt, and the United States succeeded to all the rights which Spain ever had—first, by the cession from France in 1803, and, second, by virtue of the Florida treaty and cession from Spain in 1819.

THE REAL DISCOVERER OF THE "OREGON COUNTRY."

Whatever may be said as to discovery, tenancy, occupation, exploration, and settlement of that vast region of the mighty West lying north of the forty-second parallel and extending to the ridge of the Rocky Mountains, or whatever may be the character of those claims on the part of any country, the glory of the actual discovery and of the real scientific exploration and actual settlement belongs to America and the United States, and on that high and unimpeachable title, irrespective of all others, has our country forever stood, and can forever stand, in its claim to the territory of Oregon. The only regrettable thing is that the United States should ever by compromise have bartered away unnecessarily any portion of that vast territory. The claim 54° 40', made by the Democracy in the campaign of 1844, should in my judgment never have been abandoned, but maintained to the bitter end.

The first real assertion of sovereignty in all that vast region occurred when on May 11, 1792, Captain Gray, of Boston, an American citizen and navigator and naval officer during the Revolutionary war, master of the merchant ship *Columbia*, discovered and entered the mouth of that great river of the West. He ascended its waters a distance of 25 miles, remaining there nine days, and named the river "Columbia," in honor of his ship, planted the American flag on its shores, and took possession of the country in the name of the United States. Indefatigable were the efforts of Great Britain to wrest this honor from the United States, and in

support of this effort all manner of claims were from time to time set up. A suspicion had been entertained for many years, perhaps a century prior to 1792, in the minds of Spanish and English navigators that a large river emptied somewhere into the waters of the Pacific Ocean, and the English navigators, Mears and Vancouver, had been instructed by their respective Governments to make every effort to discover it. They spent months in the years 1791 and 1792 in this effort, but without result.

"Mears," said one historian, "failed to find the mouth of the supposed river when he was led to explore for it in the Straits of Fuca, and made permanent record of his failure in the two titles he left there—'Cape Disappointment' and 'Deception Bay.'"

The same historian in speaking of Vancouver says: "Vancouver scrutinized that coast for about 250 miles and so minutely that the surf was constantly seen from the masthead to break on its shores. Thus he failed to discover the mouth of the Columbia, mistaking evidently the breakers on its fearful bars for coast surf."

This entry was made in his journal April 29, 1792, only twelve days prior to the date when Captain Gray made the discovery, and yet because the English navigator Vancouver subsequently sailed farther up the river than did Captain Gray, the latter directing him how to find the entrance, Great Britain insisted that he, and not Captain Gray, was the discoverer of the Columbia, and that all the rights which attached to such discovery belonged to England and not to the United States. In discussing this phase of the Oregon question, Professor Twiss, of Oxford University, in an elaborate paper said: "Captain Gray's claim is limited to the mouth of the river." The historian, Barrows, in commenting on this character of reasoning very pertinently says: "Thus the discovery of a river is made a progressive work by English claimants, as if one should discover the Mississippi at New Orleans, another at Memphis, another at Cairo, another at the mouth of the Missouri, and so on to the Falls of St. Anthony, as if the discovery of a lost cable were progressive as the separate links of the chain were hauled on board." "If," says the historian, "this had not been said by plenipotentiaries we should call it puerile."

Mears not only did not discover the Columbia River, but, on the contrary, he expressly declared there was no such river emptying into the Pacific Ocean. "We can now safely assert," said he in his report, "that there is no such river as that of St. Roque, as laid down on the Spanish charts." And, as if to emphasize the failure of his expectations, he named the promontory lying north of the inlet where he had expected to discover it "Cape Disappointment" and the inlet itself "Deception Bay," names by which they have been known ever since.

Gray's discovery and the purchase of Louisiana territory were quickly followed by scientific exploration on the part of the Government of the United States, as also by settlement on the part of its citizens. The expedition of Lewis and Clark organized before and sent out immediately after the Louisiana purchase was one of the most daring, difficult, dangerous, and at the same time successful, of all expeditions of which history of this or of any other country gives record. There seems to be some difference in the statements of historians as to the number composing that expedition. According to Barrows it consisted of 28 persons in all—Lewis and Clark voyageurs, 9 young Kentuckians, 14 United States soldiers, 2 Canadian voyageurs, and 1 negro, the body servant of Captain Clark. According, however, to the probably accurate notes of Doctor Cones to his new edition of the history of that expedition, it consisted of 45 men from Missouri to the Mandan country, and of 32, including Lewis and Clark, thereafter across the continent, the others returning from that point, as was the original programme.

The authority under which Captains Lewis and Clark acted, as stated in the commission issued to them by President Jefferson, was "to explore the river Missouri and its principal branches to their sources, and then to seek to trace to its termination in the Pacific some river, whether the Columbia, the Oregon, the Colorado, or any other which might offer the most direct practicable water communication across the continent for the purposes of commerce."

The time occupied by these courageous men in consummating the important and hazardous duty assigned them by their Government was two years four months and nine days, during which time they traveled more than 9,000 miles through an unbroken and trackless wilderness.

The start was made May 14, 1804, from their camp on the Mississippi near the mouth of the Missouri, and, returning, they reached St. Louis September 23, 1806. They discovered the headwaters of the Missouri and the Columbia, and followed the waters of the latter until they landed at Cape Disappointment, at the mouth of the Columbia River, in Oregon, November 15, 1805. They remained there in camp until March 23, 1806, a period of more than four months, when they commenced their ascent of the Columbia River in their canoes on their return trip.

The hardships experienced by these brave men and by the courageous pioneers—men and women—who in the next half century followed in their footsteps and braved the innumerable hardships and dangers of the far West have never been, nor can they be, fully depicted by pen or tongue. To them are the people of America greatly indebted, for they have hewn out with willing hands, borne on stalwart shoulders, and set with stability in its everlasting resting place the foundation stone of one of the grandest pillars, upon which, in part, rests to-day the superb superstructure of American development and American civilization.

How strangely interesting and pathetic is the history, and how peculiar the vicissitudes surrounding the lives of some men! Both of these intrepid explorers subsequently became governor, at different periods, of Missouri Territory. Captain William Clark, seven years after his return from the great exploring expedition that has rendered the name of Meriwether Lewis and William Clark immortal, became governor of Missouri Territory, serving in that capacity from 1813 to 1821, and as superintendent of Indian affairs at St. Louis from 1822 until his death. While Captain Meriwether Lewis, after passing through all the untold hardships and perils of that memorable expedition, returned to serve a brief time as governor of the Missouri Territory from 1807 to 1809, and then at a comparatively early age, to find a lonely grave in the forests of Tennessee, either as a *felo de se* or as a victim at the hand of an assassin, just which, history has never yet definitely determined. But where or when or how they died, they can each exclaim with the blind poet of old, "*Execi monumentum aere perennius.*"

THE UNITED STATES COUPLED SCIENTIFIC EXPLORATION AND ACTUAL SETTLEMENT WITH OCCUPANCY.

But not only by succession to every right which both France and Spain had to the "Oregon Country," either in virtue of occupancy or otherwise, not only by the right of sovereignty which attaches to the discoverer of a new country, nor yet by those rights which follow in the wake of scientific exploration, did the Government of the United States rest its claim to the territory of Oregon; but added to all these is that other accumulated right, which is the result not simply of *occupancy*, but of *actual settlement*. The law of nations recognizes a wide difference between those rights which attach to mere *occupancy* and those which attach to *actual settlement*. The natives of this territory in their wild, uncivilized state were mere *occupants*, mere *tenants*, they were not *settlers*. The Hudson Bay trappers and traders who invaded Oregon territory in pursuit of peltries and furs, were mere *occupants*, similar in all respects in the light of the law in regard to territorial rights which result from such occupancy as those which attach to the natives; they were not *settlers* within the legal signification of that term, nor did they attract to themselves those territorial and sovereign rights which international law accords to settlers. The interests of civilization, says the law of that civilization, can not permit a great empire of wild country to remain as such for the use of wild men for a game life; no less could the law of that civilization permit this great foreign monopoly, the Hudson Bay Company, to occupy such country for the sole purpose of accumulating and speculating on the spoils of the hunter, and without any effort whatever to either develop or increase the natural productions of the country, or locate or promote a single settlement.

It was, therefore, by mere *occupancy* and not by *settlement* that England sought originally to strengthen her claim and to acquire rights in the Oregon territory. With the United States and the people of the United States it was entirely different. With the latter *occupancy* was coupled with that other and higher attribute of development and civilization, namely, *scientific exploration* and *actual settlement*.

For instance, Astor's project contemplated not merely the occupancy of this distant territory for purposes similar to the Hudson Bay Company; his purposes were of a much higher order; they embraced *settlement*, the establishment of civil society, the physical development of the country, the leveling of the forests, the construction of houses, the cultivation of the land, the building of homes, the erection of schoolhouses and churches, the making of towns and cities, the establishing of marts, the creation of commercial arteries, and the establishment of such civil institutions as would tend to attach the new territory with bonds indissoluble to the States of the American Union, and thus weaken and finally and forever sever every adverse claim, and at the same time expand and develop the country and the commercial and political prestige and power of the nation. Irving, in his "Astoria," summarizes the plans and expectations of Astor in these words:

He considered his projected establishment at the mouth of the Columbia as the emporium to an immense commerce; as a colony that would form the germ of a wide civilization; that would, in fact, carry the American population across the Rocky Mountains, and spread it along the shores of the Pacific, as it already animated the shores of the Atlantic.

THE HUDSON BAY COMPANY—A POWERFUL AND INFLUENTIAL AGENT OF THE BRITISH GOVERNMENT.

That Great Britain, operating through divers influential channels, notably the Hudson Bay Company, reenforced as it was in 1821 by consolidation with the Canadian Northwest Company of Montreal, exerted a most formidable power against the settlement of Oregon territory by Americans, and the waves of whose influence reached Washington, and for a time threatened the loss of the whole territory, is an historical fact well established. That Daniel Webster, as Secretary of State, was by these influences at one time convinced that the whole territory was an unbroken waste of sandy deserts, impassable mountains and impenetrable jungles there can be no room for doubt. These powerful influences had been operating in divers ways prior to 1842 for more than a third of a century. Their effect on the individual and public mind in the East, and on the official mind as well in Washington, was marked in the highest degree. That Webster, as Secretary of State, had seriously contemplated including the whole of this territory in the Ashburton treaty, and subsequently in a separate treaty, in exchange to Great Britain for certain cod fisheries in Newfoundland, is beyond question.

The insidious and powerfully effective influences and the remarkably successful aggressions of the Hudson Bay Company are best illustrated by the triumphs it achieved in the face of what seemed insurmountable obstacles. Although its original charter dates back to Charles II of England, in 1670, by which it was granted certain important rights, forty years prior to that a similar charter had been granted to the Canadian Northwest Fur Company by Louis XIII of France. Prior to 1821 this company was in numbers, capital, influence, and power vastly superior to and a most formidable rival of the Hudson Bay Company; yet the latter, notwithstanding all this, through its superior management and great diplomacy, compelled the former in 1821 to yield to and accept its own terms as to union and consolidation, and from that date the Hudson Bay Company, thus reenforced in capital, numbers, and influence, and in the number and extent of its outposts, directed all its vast energies and immense powers to wrest from the United States and obtain eventually for Great Britain the whole of the "Oregon Country."

But notwithstanding these superior rights on the part of the United States, in virtue not only of occupancy but also of scientific exploration and settlement entitling this country to exclusive sovereign rights in the whole of the Oregon territory, the fact that the Hudson Bay Company had extended its operations into that region, and was engaged in trade there with the Indians, induced our Government to make the fatal mistake of entering into a treaty with Great Britain in 1818 providing for joint occupancy for a period of ten years. This stipulation was extended indefinitely by another treaty with Great Britain in 1827, promulgated May 15, 1828.

These treaties, however, were not intended, nor did they or either of them in any manner attempt, to determine the respective sovereign claims of the United States and Great Britain, or in fact those of any other government, to this territory; they were intended only, as expressly stated in the treaties, "to prevent disputes and differences among the occupants of that territory."

That the Government of the United States made a fearful mistake in ever consenting by treaty stipulation that Great Britain should, through its subjects, occupy the "Oregon Territory" jointly with our citizens for a period of twenty-eight years, instead of standing, in 1817, on our rights as sovereign and insisting that they should be respected, is now, I think, pretty generally conceded. The value of the furs of which this country was stripped by the Hudson Bay Company in that time was immense, amounting to many millions of dollars. In the four years, 1834 to 1837, the Hudson Bay Company alone, according to reliable statistics, killed in that region (the Oregon country) over 3,500,000 fur-bearing animals, including beaver, marten, otter, fox, muskrat, bear, ermine, fitchew, lynx, mink, wolf, badger, and raccoon. The American fur traders could not compete with the Hudson Bay Company, as all the supplies of the latter came in free of duty.

But the fact that by the joint occupancy this great monopoly was enabled to strip the country of its wealth was as nothing compared with the powerfully hostile influence it constantly exerted against the settlement of the country by Americans and the foothold it afforded Great Britain, enabling that power to successfully postpone for nearly a century the final settlement of the question as to our rights, and which in the end compelled us to compromise and deprived us of that vast extent of territory lying between the forty-ninth parallel and 54° 40', the Rocky Mountains and the Pacific Ocean. Thomas H. Benton and many other leading men denounced this policy of joint occupation. Senator Benton, in 1845, referring to the treaty of joint occupancy, said: "I have been clear against joint occupation for twenty-eight years as a treaty of unmixed mischief to the United States." Histo-

rians agree that this company stripped the "Oregon Country" of furs of the value of over \$1,000,000 annually, amounting to perhaps \$30,000,000 in the twenty-eight years of joint occupancy.

It was the entirely too ready disposition on the part of our Government at the outset, in 1824, 1826, and 1829, to compromise our rights in the Oregon territory which resulted eventually in a loss to this country of territory the value of which can not be estimated. Both Presidents Tyler and Polk were handicapped by the offer of settlement made to Great Britain under former administrations, in which the Government had consented from time to time to a compromise on the forty-ninth parallel. This, then, was the status of the "Oregon Country" from the date of our treaty with Great Britain in 1818 until our treaty of 1846, a period of twenty-eight years. It was one of joint occupancy in virtue of treaty stipulations between the two countries, and it was during these twenty-eight years that the great battle as to the ultimate ownership of Oregon was fought and won. It was not wholly, though in part, a warfare of men on the field of carnage. It was a mighty, a prolonged—in one sense a physical, and in another sense a diplomatic—contest between the vanguards of two civilizations and of two mighty nations, each contending with the other for the supremacy, and each also with the uncivilized, bloodthirsty savages whose country was being invaded, though for their civilization and ultimate good. Such was the political status, emphasized by treaty stipulation, as to induce the belief on the part of Great Britain that the ultimate right to the whole territory would be determined, not so much by the question of *priority of discovery, exploration, and settlement*, but rather by the *character and extent of settlement* in the years that should intervene during the period of joint occupancy, and before the final decision should be made by arbitration or otherwise.

During this period two processes seemed to inspire the Government of Great Britain as a means of ultimately securing to herself the absolute ownership of the whole of the vast "Oregon Country." One was to impress on our public men and the Government at Washington in every possible manner the alleged worthlessness of the territory; the other was to push forward unremittently through the instrumentality of the great governmental organ, the Hudson Bay Company, actual settlements in the territory. That they succeeded in a very large degree in impressing many of the prominent officials of our Government that the whole territory was a worthless waste, not worth having, much less worth contending for, is made clearly apparent from the Congressional debates during the twenty-eight years of joint occupancy, and for many years thereafter, even as late as 1846.

In view of the present status of this mighty empire of civilization and human progress it would not be uninteresting, but rather amusing, to recall some of the declarations made in the Senate of the United States by prominent men who had been thus influenced by misleading representations and reports from these sources. For instance, Senator McDuffie, of South Carolina, in discussing in the United States Senate in 1843 the bill of Senator Linn, of Missouri, extending the laws of the United States over the territory of Oregon, and proposing grants of the public lands to American citizens as an inducement to settlers, which bill first passed the Senate February 3, 1843, said:

The whole region beyond the Rocky Mountains, and a vast tract between that chain and the Mississippi, is a desert, without value for agricultural purposes, and which no American citizen should be compelled to inhabit unless as a punishment for crime. Why, sir, of what use will this territory be for agricultural purposes? I would not for that purpose give a pinch of snuff for the whole territory. I wish to God we did not own it. I wish it was an impassable barrier to secure us from the intrusion of others. This is the character of the country. Who are we going to send there? Do you think your honest farmers in Pennsylvania, New York, or even Ohio and Missouri, will abandon their farms to go upon any such enterprise as this? God forbid, if any man is to go to that country under the temptation of this bill.

Finally Senator McDuffie concluded his speech by saying: "If I had a son who was a fit subject for Botany Bay, I would urge him to go there."

But not only leading statesmen of the country but eminent historians of that time were laboring under the fearful delusion as to the character and value of the Oregon country. Greenhow, writing in 1844, in his "History of Oregon and California," after stating his knowledge and views as to the region included in Oregon Territory, says:

Thus, on reviewing the agricultural, commercial, and other economical advantages of Oregon, there appears to be no reason, founded on such considerations, which should render either of the powers claiming the possession of that country anxious to occupy it immediately or unwilling to concede its own pretensions to the other for a very moderate compensation.

Even Senator Benton, of Missouri, who subsequently became one of the great defenders of our rights in Oregon, though unfortunately never to the full extent of our rightful claim to territory in the North, but only to the forty-ninth parallel, as late as 1825 regarded Oregon as not worth holding. In that year, in his place in this Senate, he said:

The ridge of the Rocky Mountains may be named as a convenient, natural, and everlasting boundary. Along this ridge the western limits of the Republic should be drawn, and the statue of the fabled god "Terminus" should be erected on its highest peak, never to be thrown down.

But, thanks to the brave pioneer heroes whose names and memories are rightfully forever embalmed in the affections of every true American, the western limits of the Republic were not drawn on the ridge of the Rocky Mountains. The fabled god "Terminus" was never stationed there. Providence had willed it otherwise and a brave and courageous people executed that will.

But still more startling is the fact that twenty-one years after Senator Benton made the declaration I have just quoted, Senator Winthrop, of Massachusetts, as late as 1846, quoted what Benton had said in 1825, and then remarked:

This country will not be straitened for elbow room in the West for a thousand years, and neither the West nor the country at large has any real interest in retaining Oregon.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FULTON in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. MITCHELL. Certainly.

Mr. HOAR. I should like to make a brief statement, if the Senator has no objection; and if he has, I will not have what I am about to say put into his speech, even after I have said it.

Mr. MITCHELL. I have no objection. I yield.

Mr. HOAR. But I should like to say, in justice to Mr. Winthrop, that that declaration of his was made one year before the discovery of the electric telegraph.

Mr. MITCHELL. That is true.

Mr. HOAR. To that extent Mr. Winthrop lived to see his mistake. The statements in question were made when a transcontinental railroad was considered a mere chimera, and there was no telegraphic communication known at that time.

If the Senator from Oregon does not object to having my statement in regard to Mr. Winthrop go into his speech, I should be glad to have it go in.

Mr. MITCHELL. That is all very true, and I have no objection to the Senator's statement going into the RECORD. It should be borne in mind, however, that in addition to the lack of means of information the Hudson Bay Company, as the active agent of Great Britain, was constantly conveying the impression to the public men of the country that the Oregon country was a worthless waste.

Mr. HOAR. I suppose my honorable friend himself would say that he has very grave doubt whether a union between the Pacific and Atlantic States could be maintained without railroad communication and without telegraphic communication.

Mr. MITCHELL. They are very important instrumentalities, great factors in consolidation and national cohesion.

The Hudson Bay Company, through whose active influence this false sentiment was mainly created, was in every essential sense the direct, active, and all-powerful agent of the British Government. It held its charter and its licenses from that Government. Its officers were superintended by a governor and deputy governor and a committee of directors resident in London, while a resident governor superintended and directed its vast operations in America. The officers and members of the Hudson Bay Company were, as a rule, under the domination of the home government. One grand exception, however, stands out in history. Dr. John McLaughlin was a true friend of the American pioneer. Brave, generous, noble, his house, his larder, his horses, his cattle were all at the service of the poor, travel-worn, weary, and discouraged immigrant. But for this disposition and these noble qualities he was ostracized by the company and by the British Government, driven into exile at Oregon City, there to end his days, yet respected, venerated, honored by the pioneers of Oregon and all who knew him and his history.

PRESIDENT POLK'S ADMINISTRATION—54° 40' OR FIGHT.

Pending discussions in Cabinet and Congress at Washington as to the supposed valueless character of the whole "Oregon Country," and as to the inadvisability of any particular effort being made to retain it, Doctor Whitman made his memorable ride across the continent in the winter of 1842 and 1843. The fame of this winter journey upon the part of Doctor Whitman extended throughout the nation, and the subject of Oregon and the rights of the United States in respect to the "Oregon Country" were matters of wide discussion in all political circles. Public sentiment was wrought up to the highest pitch, and as a result the Democratic national convention which met at Baltimore in 1844 had as one of its planks "Fifty-four forty or fight," and on this platform the Polk Administration came into power. The embarrassments, however, with which it was surrounded, growing out of the Oregon question and this particular plank in the platform, were many. President Polk found that preceding negotiations during the Administrations of his predecessors, Monroe, Adams, and Tyler, had not proceeded on the part of the United States on

the theory of our right to fifty-four forty; that the negotiations proceeded rather on the idea that they should treat the respective claims of the two countries in the Oregon territory with a view to establishing a permanent boundary between them west of the Rocky Mountains to the Pacific Ocean, and in this compromising spirit these Administrations had proposed to fix the boundary on the forty-ninth parallel.

To add to the embarrassment, many leading Democratic Senators, including Benton, of Missouri, scouted at the idea that our rights extended to fifty-four forty and insisted that we had no rights extending northward farther than the forty-ninth parallel. To add still further to the embarrassment of the situation, Great Britain, through her minister, on June 6, 1846, before the Administration of Mr. Polk was cleverly launched, submitted a proposition, the same that was finally agreed on, of the forty-ninth parallel, and coupled with it the suggestion that it must be accepted at once and without delay, if at all. In this great political dilemma President Polk resorted to a course which, though adopted a few times in the early years of our Government, had not been resorted to for nearly one-half a century—that is, of asking the advice of the Senate of the United States in advance of action on the part of the Executive. Consequently, on June 10, 1846, President Polk transmitted to the Senate the proposal, in the form of a convention presented to the Secretary of State on the 6th of that month by the British envoy, for its advice. Mr. Polk's message transmitting this convention concluded as follows:

Should the Senate, by the constitutional majority required for the ratification of treaties, advise the acceptance of these propositions, or advise it with such modifications as they may upon full deliberation deem proper, I shall conform my action to their advice. Should the Senate, however, decline by such constitutional majority to give such advice, or to express an opinion upon the subject, I will consider it my duty to reject the offer.

In other words, President Polk, encompassed on the one hand by the plank in the platform on which he was elected of "Fifty-four forty or fight," and on the other hand by the action of preceding Administrations in conflict with the proposition, his party leaders divided on the question, and the issue brought directly to the front by Great Britain, concluded to and did throw the whole responsibility on the Senate of the United States. Two days subsequently, June 12, 1846, the Senate adopted a resolution advising the President to accept the proposal of the British Government, and as a result the convention was finally agreed to June 15, 1846. So, although this memorable controversy had remained unsettled for nearly half a century, it is a remarkable historical fact that but nine days elapsed between the submission of the final proposition to compromise by Great Britain and the signing of the treaty.

Notwithstanding the fact that one hundred and eleven years have elapsed since the discovery of the Columbia River by Captain Gray, one hundred years since the cession of Louisiana, and eighty-four years since our cession from Spain, the settlement of our title to a certain portion of Oregon was held in abeyance until October 21, 1872, only thirty-one years ago—that was the island of San Juan. The treaty of June 15, 1846, between the United States and Great Britain, which was intended to settle all questions relating to our northern boundary, inadvertently left the question as to the title to this island an open one. The treaty in defining the northern boundary of the United States from a point in the Rocky Mountains on the forty-ninth parallel (from which point east the boundary line had been fixed by the second article of the treaty of Washington in 1842) read as follows:

Shall be continued westward along said forty-ninth parallel of north latitude to the middle of the channel which separates the continent from Vancouver's Island, and then southerly through the middle of said channel and Fuca Strait to the Pacific Ocean.

This island is located in the "channel" mentioned in this treaty, and the question at once arose, and for a period of twenty-five years was a source of aggravating controversy between this country and Great Britain, at one time very nearly involving the two nations in war, as to which was the "channel" referred to in the treaty. Great Britain, true to a national tendency, insisted that the "channel" referred to in the treaty was on the south side of the island, while the United States contended that Haro Channel, on the north side of the island, was the main channel within the meaning of the treaty.

This minor boundary controversy was finally adjusted by the provision in our treaty with Great Britain of May 6, 1871, submitting the question to the arbitration of the German Emperor, who on October 21, 1872, made his award, sustaining the contention of the United States; and thus after a period of nearly eighty years, dating from the discovery of the Columbia by Captain Gray, and after a period of nearly seventy years from the date of crossing the continent by Lewis and Clark, the whole question as to the ownership of the Oregon country was finally determined. Not, however, without a sacrifice of important rights as to our northern boundary in the interest of compromise.

THE DIPLOMATIC CONTROVERSY BETWEEN GREAT BRITAIN AND THE UNITED STATES OVER THE OWNERSHIP OF THE "OREGON COUNTRY."

The history of the diplomatic controversy between the United States and Great Britain involving the Oregon country is highly interesting.

One contention of Great Britain respecting the Oregon territory which was very earnestly and with some degree of facetiousness asserted by the British minister, Packenham, was that the different titles under which we claimed were conflicting, and therefore destroyed each other, namely, discovery by Spain, cession from France, and discovery and settlement by American citizens.

But Mr. Calhoun, as Secretary of State, in his letter to Mr. Packenham, disposed of the assertion as follows:

It has been objected that we claim under various and conflicting titles which mutually destroy each other. Such might indeed be the fact while they were held by different parties, but since we have rightfully acquired both those of Spain and France and concentrated the whole in our own hands they mutually blend with each other and form one strong and connecting chain of title against the opposing claims of all others, including Great Britain.

While Mr. Buchanan, as Secretary of State, in referring to this phase of the case, said:

This is a most ingenious method of making two distinct and independent titles, held by the same nation, worse than one—of arraying them against each other, and thus destroying the validity of both. From the moment Spain transferred all her rights to the United States all possible conflict between the two titles ended, both being united in the same party. Two titles which might have conflicted, therefore, were thus blended together. The title now vested in the United States is just as strong as though every act of discovery, exploration, and settlement on the part of both powers had been performed by Spain alone before she transferred all her rights to the United States. The two powers are one in this respect, the two titles are one, and they serve to confirm and strengthen each other.

Again, Great Britain, through her plenipotentiaries, sought to discredit the effect of the discovery of the Columbia River by Capt. Robert Gray, for the reason, as suggested, that his ship, the *Columbia*, was a trading and not a national vessel. This contention, however, was speedily disposed of by Mr. Buchanan with this remark:

The British plenipotentiary attempts to depreciate the value to the United States of Gray's discovery because his ship, the *Columbia*, was a trading and not a national vessel. As he furnishes no reason for this distinction, the undersigned will confine himself to the remark that a merchant vessel bears the flag of her country at the masthead, and continues under its jurisdiction and protection in the same manner as though she had been commissioned for the express purpose of making discoveries.

In this long, interesting, and able diplomatic contest one of the most interesting questions discussed was as to what extent continuity of boundary furnishes a just claim in connection with those of discovery and occupation. This question grew out of the claim on the part of the United States that the Louisiana Territory extended to the Pacific Ocean. This claim was denied on the part of Great Britain. It was insisted, however, with great ability, by Secretary of State Calhoun, and subsequently by Secretary Buchanan, as follows:

First, that the claim was valid under public law; and
Second, that Great Britain having asserted the validity of the doctrine in reference to her possessions in this country as against France, even to the extent of going to war with that power in 1763, she was estopped from denying the validity of the doctrine as against the United States, especially inasmuch as our people had contributed so much to the result in that contest favorable to Great Britain; and it was further contended by our diplomats that Great Britain, whatever may have been her rights in Oregon territory, relinquished all to France by the seventh article of the treaty between Great Britain and France at the close of that war in 1783.

The controversy in regard to the correct northern boundary of the Oregon territory, whether the forty-ninth parallel, as now agreed upon, except along the Straits of Fuca, or 54° 40' north, is familiar to all. Spain unquestionably always asserted claim as far north as the sixty-first parallel, but in her treaty with Russia 54° 40' was recognized. It was claimed, however, that by the treaty of Utrecht in 1713, which provided for determining "the limits to be fixed between the Bay of Hudson and the places appertaining to the French," the boundary between Louisiana and the British territories north of it was actually fixed by commissioners on latitude 49°. Whether this is true or not is a matter of very serious dispute. A careful examination of all history bearing upon the point leads me to the conclusion that such was not the fact.

In reply to the claim of the United States to go to 54° 40' it was asserted that whatever might have been the right of Spain, the latter in ceding to France in 1800, stipulated to convey only as far north as the forty-ninth parallel. To this contention the United States replied, and with much force, and the contention should never have been abandoned: "If this be so, and if it be true the right of Spain is good to 54° 40', then the strip between the forty-ninth parallel and 54° 40', which it was alleged was not included in the cession of Spain to France in 1800, was included

in the cession of Spain to the United States in the treaty of Florida of 1819, by which Spain conveyed every right she had on the continent north of the forty-second parallel." In discussing this phase of the question, Mr. Secretary Buchanan, in his reply to Packenham, said:

It is an historical and striking fact, which must have an important bearing against the claim of Great Britain, that the Nootka convention, which was dictated by her to Spain, contains no provision impairing the ultimate sovereignty which that power had asserted for nearly three centuries over the whole northwestern side of North America, as far north as the sixty-first degree of latitude, and which had never been seriously questioned by any European nation.

Subsequently, in 1818 and down to the final settlement of the boundary question in 1846, the only material difference in the views of American statesmen and diplomatists was as to whether the rightful claim of the United States extended to 54° 40' or only to the forty-ninth parallel. All concurred in the opinion that our claim was beyond question good, at least as far north as the latter, while many of our ablest statesmen and diplomatists, strengthened and supported by a powerful sentiment among the people, insisted that our claim extended to 54° 40'.

FINANCIAL FAILURES HERETOFORE NO ARGUMENT AGAINST FUTURE EXPOSITIONS.

The fact that some expositions in the past have been financial failures is no valid argument in opposition to the promotion of expositions. The basic principle upon which the advocates of the propriety, the feasibility, and advisability of expositions rely as a conclusive argument in their favor and in favor of their recognition and support by the General Government is not by any means that of financial benefit to the promoters and managers of such expositions. If this were so, the claim for Government recognition and aid would, I concede, rest on a most unsubstantial and flimsy basis. Considerations of a vastly higher nature and of infinitely more importance than the mere question of immediate financial gain in dollars and cents are involved. They are those which relate to the individual and general welfare in a physical, intellectual, and moral sense to national growth and patriotism and to civilization itself.

PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT'S CORDIAL INDORSEMENT AND EARNEST RECOMMENDATION.

It is gratifying that the present Chief Executive of the nation finds in these expositions justification and warrant for substantial governmental recognition and aid. In President Roosevelt's recent message he says:

I trust that the Congress will continue to favor in all proper ways the Louisiana Purchase Exposition. This exposition commemorates the Louisiana purchase, which was the first great step in the expansion which made us a continental nation. The expedition of Lewis and Clark across the continent followed thereon and marked the beginning of the process of exploration and colonization which thrust our national boundary to the Pacific. The acquisition of the Oregon Country, including the present States of Oregon and Washington, was a fact of immense importance in our history, first giving us our place on the Pacific seaboard and making ready the way for our ascendancy in the commerce of the greatest of the oceans. The centennial of our establishment upon the western coast by the expedition of Lewis and Clark is to be celebrated at Portland, Oreg., by an exposition in the summer of 1905, and this event should receive recognition and support from the National Government.

THE "OREGON COUNTRY"—THE STATES OF OREGON, WASHINGTON, IDAHO, AND PARTS OF MONTANA AND WYOMING CAN FURNISH HOMES FOR 50,000,000 PEOPLE.

An exhibit of what the "Oregon Country" is to-day, the character, diversity, and extent of its products, will illustrate not only the present productive capacity, but the possibilities of that vast empire and its capacity to furnish homes for 50,000,000 people. Even then the density of the population will be considerably less than that of many European countries. And is it not a fact that any enterprise that tends to facilitate the speedy occupation and settlement of this prolific section of the American domain will contribute not only vastly to the general welfare, prosperity, and happiness of the people of this country, but to the promotion of the best and most exalted interests of the Government of the United States? And in this connection I submit, Will anything this Government can do, or that the people of the "Oregon Country" can do, contribute so readily and efficiently to this grand consummation as will the proposed national, international, and oriental exposition, in the aid of which the pending bill has been presented?

In support of the statement I have just made of the capacity of what was once known as the "Oregon Country" to furnish homes for 50,000,000 people, I call attention to the fact that there were, on June 30 last, within that area, undisposed of public lands to the number of 85,469,037 acres. Of these, 23,105,816 acres lie within the State of Oregon, 9,485,192 acres in the State of Washington, and 41,785,780 acres in the State of Idaho, while in that part of the State of Montana which was formerly part of the "Oregon Country" there were, on June 30 last, approximately 7,801,813 acres, and in that portion of Wyoming formerly part of the "Oregon Country" 3,291,136 acres.

This is an age of advancement; it is an age of development; it is an age of progress; it is an age of expansion; it is an age in which the very highest ideals of American enterprise and civilization are being promoted. A spirit of genuine strenuousness and patriotic advancement pervades the American mind. This spirit is being rightfully and patriotically led with commendable vigor by one of the most genuinely aggressive, vigorous, and patriotic Presidents that has ever occupied the Presidential chair. The President is a thorough believer in the great beneficial effects of a national and international exposition. He believes in and has the courage to declare in favor of national recognition and governmental aid of the proposed Lewis and Clark Exposition. I, therefore, for this and other reasons, am naturally and properly for the President, for the Lewis and Clark Exposition, and, above all, I am for the flag and for the appropriation.

A contrast between the status of the "Oregon Country" one hundred years ago and its present status presents a historical lesson of marvelous importance and profound interest.

The displacement of the hut of the savage and the home of the barbarian by the schoolhouse, the academy, seminary, and university, and the innumerable homes of civilized, educated, Christianized and happy people, illustrates the civilizing and Christianizing influences that naturally and necessarily followed in the way opened to them by the grand expeditionary enterprise of Lewis and Clark. We find in this century a wilderness covering nearly one-half of the continent transformed into a land of beauty, of promise, of production, of elevation to a position of civilization second to none in all the history of nations; a country now productive in the highest degree in agriculture, in commerce, in manufactures, in fisheries, in mineral wealth, in fruits and berries of every description—apples, cherries, peaches, pears, prunes, grapes—and in cereals of every character.

The salmon fisheries of the Columbia River, producing annually hundreds of thousands of the finest fish that ever satiated the palate of man; the vast lumbering establishments scattered throughout this vast domain, turning out every hour millions of feet of fir, pine, cedar, hemlock, maple, myrtle, and other kinds of the finest lumber ever manufactured; its innumerable highly productive mines of gold and silver and copper and cinnabar and coal and asbestos; its flocks and herds of millions of cattle, sheep, goats, and other live stock; its schools and colleges and other institutions of learning; its churches, its asylums, and other eleemosynary and charitable institutions; its more than a million of happy, enterprising, and progressive people, and its ever-increasing commerce and expanding trade all bear testimony of the highest and most interesting character to the marvelous development of the "Oregon Country" in the last one hundred years.

RAILROADS IN THE "OREGON COUNTRY."

As an evidence of the marvelous industrial development of the "Oregon Country" it may be remarked that while forty years ago there was not a single mile of railroad in the whole "Oregon Country," there is to-day constructed, magnificently equipped, and in operation in that territory more than 7,459 miles of first-class railroad. Of these there are in Oregon, 1,844.22 miles; in the State of Washington, 3,182.77 miles; in the State of Idaho, 1,433 miles, and in those portions of Montana and Wyoming formerly included in the "Oregon Country," about 1,000 miles; and in the aggregate representing a money value of more than \$372,950,000.

But here is not the time or place to exploit at great length the character, the number, and magnitude or the value of the present productions of the Oregon Country. To do this in a more appropriate manner we respectfully but earnestly implore the aid of the General Government, to the end that in the year 1905, at Portland, Oreg., we may be able to present to the people, not alone of America, but also to those of Europe and Asia and the islands of the sea, and especially to the people of the United States and those of the Orient, the grand progress made in the past one hundred years in physical, intellectual, and moral development in what one hundred years ago was known as the "Oregon Country."

We desire to make an exhibit, not only to the people of the United States, but also to those of all nations, of the unlimited productive capacity and present products of the "Oregon Country" in all of those elements that constitute the highest standard of American development, human progress, and civilization.

The extension of our national boundaries by the inclusion of the Hawaiian and Philippine Islands opens a new era in American statesmanship, American diplomacy, and American enterprise. By this, the western boundary line of the Republic, instead of being located along the ridge of the Rocky Mountains, as suggested by Thomas Benton in 1825, is extended so as to include the thousand or more of the Philippine Islands, and the statue of the fabled god "Terminus," so far from being erected on the ridge of the Rocky Mountains, as suggested by Benton in 1825, as the western boundary of the Republic, must now be located on the

most western limits of the most western island of the Philippine Archipelago, there to stand forever and forevermore the far western outpost of the American Republic.

To promote and advance our trade, to develop and increase our commerce not only with our island possessions, but also with the people and nations of the Orient, with Russia and China and Japan in the Far East, is the proud ambition of the brave, energetic business men, not only in the cities of San Francisco, of Portland, of Tacoma, and Seattle, but of all who now control the commercial and trade destinies of what was once the "Oregon Country."

The exposition, which it is their purpose shall be held in Portland, Oreg., in 1905, will be a most beneficial factor in promoting not only domestic commerce, but will also stimulate and promote the national and international trade and commerce in which the whole people and the Government of the United States are so vitally interested. This is a question that is not in its effect and operation limited to the interests of the people and States of the Pacific coast. New England, the Southern, and the Central States, and the distinguished representatives of these great sections of our common country, will, I am sure, not hesitate to lend their cordial cooperation in aid of the grand centennial exposition in behalf of the great historical achievement of Lewis and Clark.

A spirit of national pride, of national patriotism, and of national desire upon the part of the distinguished representatives of all sections of this great country will, I am sure, stimulate them to join hands with the representatives of the great West and Pacific Northwest in enabling them to exhibit in an appropriate manner what they and their predecessors have done in the interest of human progress and American civilization in the past one hundred years.

THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT HAS IN THE LAST FORTY-ONE YEARS AIDED ELEVEN HOME EXPOSITIONS AND TEN FOREIGN EXPOSITIONS, AND HAS APPROPRIATED IN THE AGGREGATE FOR THIS PURPOSE THE SUM OF \$21,107,852.15.

The Congress of the United States has since 1875 extended aid in behalf of expositions held in the United States at the following places and in the following amounts:

Philadelphia, Pa., 1876.....	\$2,533,184.59
New Orleans, La., 1884.....	1,650,000.00
Louisville, Ky., 1884.....	10,000.00
Cincinnati, Ohio, 1885.....	157,750.00
Chicago, Ill., 1893.....	5,840,329.64
Atlanta, Ga., 1894.....	200,000.00
Nashville, Tenn., 1896.....	130,000.00
Omaha, Nebr., 1897.....	240,000.00
Buffalo, N. Y., 1902.....	1,015,000.00
Charleston, S. C., 1902.....	250,000.00
For St. Louis Exposition next year.....	6,478,000.00

Since the year 1861 the Congress of the United States has aided ten foreign expositions, as follows:

London, England, 1862.....	72,000.00
Vienna, Austria, 1873.....	200,000.00
Sidney, New South Wales, 1879.....	20,000.00
Melbourne, Australia, 1880.....	58,000.00
Berlin, Germany, 1880.....	20,000.00
Barcelona, Spain, 1888.....	28,380.26
Brussels, Belgium, 1888.....	35,000.00
Madrid, Spain, 1892.....	25,000.00
Bergen, Norway, 1898.....	20,000.00

While aid has been extended to three expositions in Paris, France, as follows:

1867.....	\$212,703.00
1878.....	190,000.00
1900.....	1,722,504.66

Making a total in aid of Paris expositions of..... 2,125,207.66

Making a grand total of..... 21,107,852.15

And yet, notwithstanding all this magnificent aid in favor of expositions, national and international, not one dollar has been appropriated in aid of any such enterprise west of the Rocky Mountains, and, with the exception of the aid extended to the Omaha Exposition, not a dollar has been appropriated in aid of any exposition west of the Missouri River.

CLIMATE—SCENERY.

The city of Portland, Oreg., has one decided and most important advantage over the city of St. Louis as a place for an exhibition. In no part of the United States can there be found a more superbly delightful summer climate than in Portland, Oreg. The atmosphere is clear, cool, invigorating, and such a thing as op-

pressive summer heat is a thing unknown. The city is clean and healthful and supplied with the very best cold water from a mountain stream. The scenery in and around Portland is unequalled by any other on the continent. Five stalwart mountain peaks, covered with perpetual snow, stand in imperial grandeur at its very gates. These are Tacoma, or Rainier, St. Helens, Adams, Hood, and Jefferson. These are the joy and adoration of its own people and the wonder and admiration of the thousands of tourists who annually visit the Pacific coast. No summer watering place of seaside or mountain in any part of the United States furnishes any greater or better advantages for rest and enjoyment than does the climate and scenery of Portland, Oreg.

THE NAME "OREGON."

It has been a subject of some considerable and interesting speculation among writers of distinction as to the origin of the name "Oregon." Some of these have declared with some degree of positiveness that it is derived from the Spanish, signifying "wild thyme," so called on account of the abundance of that herb found by early explorers. Others insist that it is an Indian word, in use about the headwaters of the Columbia to designate the waters of that river and meaning the "great river of the west," and obtained from them by Jonathan Carver, a native of Connecticut, in 1766-1768, who spent two years among the Indians on the waters of the upper Mississippi, now the State of Wisconsin.

Carver's accounts, however, in reference to many matters, are contradictory and unreliable, though in reference to this it is very probable he was quite right. It is more than probable that an article published about sixty-one years ago, in 1842, in Hunt's Magazine, and reproduced by the historian Brown in his political history of Oregon, presents the correct solution of the question. Speaking of Oregon Territory and the discovery of the Columbia River by Captain Gray, this article says: "The territory watered by this river and its tributaries has since"—that is, since the discovery of the river—"been called the 'Oregon Country,' from a tradition said to have prevailed among the Indians near Lake Superior of the existence of a mighty river rising in that vicinity and emptying its waters into the Pacific, and which was supposed to be the Columbia." Bryant in his celebrated "Thanatopsis," written in 1815, refers to the Columbia River as the "Oregon:" "Where rolls the Oregon, and hears no sound save his own dashing."

THE BENEFITS OF NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL EXPOSITIONS.

National, international, and scientific expositions in commemoration of great historic events, such as the discovery by Columbus of the Bahama group in 1492 and of the continent in 1498; the landing of the Pilgrims in 1620; the first permanent English settlement in America at Jamestown, Va., by the brave 105 colonists under Christopher Newport in 1607; the Declaration of Independence, July 4, 1776; the purchase of Louisiana territory by Thomas Jefferson in 1803, and the military expedition of Lewis and Clark are, as was so tersely and beautifully said by the late President McKinley in his last public address to his countrymen, "timekeepers of progress." They correspond to the balancing of the books of the National Treasury at the close of each fiscal year. They are, as great historical landmarks, in a sense similar to the epochs covered by the lives of great men who tower in history here and there along the great march of human events, such as Washington, Jefferson, Jackson, Calhoun, Clay, Webster, Lincoln, Grant, and McKinley, and many others that might be named, whose names and achievements an appreciative people delight to honor and whose deeds will ever be held in grateful remembrance.

Such expositions, in commemoration of such great historical events, to which allusion is made, are mighty national object lessons, pregnant with instruction, inspirational in their tendency, and which unfold to the general public, to all people, and all nations the character and degree of progress made in physical, intellectual, and moral development, and in all that pertains to national growth and human progress during the period covered by the epoch.

By these expositions the rapidity of the materialization, of the progress and development of all those essential elements which constitute the highest type of modern civilization is clearly exemplified, while they serve to encourage and stimulate our people and our Government to greater activities and into the adoption and promotion of more exalted ideals, and more forceful, persistent, and determined effort in all relations of individual and national life.

CONCLUSION.

Let us, therefore, have an exposition worthy the name of the illustrious men, and their grand achievements, in whose commemoration it is to be held; an exposition worthy the patriotic pioneers who established the foundations of a mighty empire of

political and commercial power in the far West; an exposition worthy of the present generation of intelligent, stalwart, and enterprising people now occupying the "Oregon Country;" but above all an exposition worthy the cordial recognition and liberal aid of the National Government; an exposition that will disclose not only to all of the people of the United States, both of the mainland and islands, but also to the people of the Orient and of Europe, something of our present and rapidly increasing greatness as a people, and the present status, politically, commercially, and otherwise, of one of the most interesting, virile, and enterprising sections of the American Union. *Fiat lux.*

Mr. FULTON. Mr. President, I desire to address the Senate briefly on the bill on which my colleague [Mr. MITCHELL] has just spoken, and, therefore, I wish now to give notice that to-morrow morning, after the conclusion of the routine business, I shall ask unanimous consent of the Senate to be heard upon the subject. I wish to say that my remarks will be brief. I shall not take more than twenty minutes or half an hour.

Mr. BACON. I ask the Senator, as he used the expression "routine business," does he mean after the morning hour?

Mr. FULTON. After the morning hour, I should have said.

MONUMENT ON PRINCETON BATTLEFIELD.

Mr. CULLOM. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. KEAN. I ask the Senator to withhold the motion for a few minutes in order that I may ask for the consideration of a small bill.

Mr. CULLOM. I will withhold the motion for that purpose.

Mr. KEAN. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 39) in regard to a monumental column to commemorate the battle of Princeton, and appropriating \$30,000 therefor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be read for information, subject to objection.

The Secretary read the bill, as follows:

Whereas the Princeton Battle Monument Association, a corporation, has been created under and by virtue of the laws of the State of New Jersey for the purpose of erecting a monument on or near the battlefield of Princeton, in the State of New Jersey: Therefore,

Be it enacted, etc., That the sum of \$30,000 be, and the same is hereby, appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be expended by said association under the direction of the Secretary of War to aid in erecting and completing, on the battlefield of Princeton, in the State of New Jersey, a suitable monument: *Provided,* That no part of the sum herein appropriated shall be available until the Princeton Battle Monument Association shall have raised an additional sum of \$30,000, to be expended in the erection of said monument and in the purchase and improvement of the site: *And provided further,* That the design for said monument shall be approved by the Secretary of War.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

MONUMENT TO HENRY WADSWORTH LONGFELLOW.

Mr. HOAR. If there be no objection, I should like to call up a joint resolution which was reported this morning from the Committee on the Library by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. WETMORE]. It is the joint resolution (S. R. 20) authorizing the selection of a site and the erection of a pedestal for a bronze statue in Washington, D. C., in honor of the late Henry Wadsworth Longfellow.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution has gone to the Public Printer and has not yet been returned. It will be here in the morning.

Mr. HOAR. Very well.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. CULLOM. I now renew my motion that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After twenty-three minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 5 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, December 18, 1903, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 17, 1903.

INDIAN AGENT.

Luther S. Kelly, of New York, to be agent for the Indians of the San Carlos Agency, in Arizona, vice George D. Corson, removed.

MARSHALS.

Gilbert B. Deans, of Alabama, to be United States marshal for the southern district of Alabama, vice Frank Simmons, resigned.

William H. Grimshaw, of Minnesota, to be United States marshal for the district of Minnesota. A reappointment, his term expiring December 18, 1903.

SURVEYOR OF CUSTOMS.

Charles J. Robb, of Indiana, to be surveyor of customs for the port of Michigan City, in the State of Indiana. (Reappointment.)

POSTMASTERS.

ALABAMA.

James M. Ragan to be postmaster at Anniston, in the county of Calhoun and State of Alabama, in place of Lansing T. Smith. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1903.

Hattie N. Tabb to be postmaster at Thomasville, in the county of Clark and State of Alabama. Office became Presidential January 1, 1903.

CALIFORNIA.

Horace B. Gardiner to be postmaster at Crockett, in the county of Contra Costa and State of California, in place of Horace B. Gardiner. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1903.

Charles S. Graham to be postmaster at Pleasanton, in the county of Alameda and State of California, in place of Charles S. Graham. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1903.

COLORADO.

Frank E. Baker to be postmaster at Fort Morgan, in the county of Morgan and State of Colorado, in place of Frank E. Baker. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1903.

John F. Morgan to be postmaster at Colorado City, in the county of El Paso and State of Colorado, in place of John F. Morgan. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1903.

Daniel M. Sullivan to be postmaster at Cripple Creek, in the county of Teller and State of Colorado, in place of Daniel M. Sullivan. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1903.

DELAWARE.

Joseph M. Harrington to be postmaster at Felton, in the county of Kent and State of Delaware. Office became Presidential July 1, 1903.

GEORGIA.

John I. Fullwood to be postmaster at Cedartown, in the county of Polk and State of Georgia, in place of William A. Chapman. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1903.

IDAHO.

William J. Turner to be postmaster at Mountain Home, in the county of Elmore and State of Idaho, in place of William J. Turner. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1903.

ILLINOIS.

David H. Baker to be postmaster at Tiskilwa, in the county of Bureau and State of Illinois, in place of David H. Baker. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1903.

Thomas E. Ballinger to be postmaster at Chenoa, in the county of McLean and State of Illinois, in place of Thomas E. Ballinger. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1903.

INDIANA.

Knobe D. Porter to be postmaster at Hagerstown, in the county of Wayne and State of Indiana, in place of William H. H. Pitman. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1903.

INDIAN TERRITORY.

Frederick S. Walker to be postmaster at Afton, in the Cherokee Nation, Indian Territory. Office became Presidential July 1, 1903.

IOWA.

Hamline W. Robinson to be postmaster at Colfax, in the county of Jasper and State of Iowa, in place of Hamline W. Robinson. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1903.

KANSAS.

George H. Leisenring to be postmaster at Ellis, in the county of Ellis and State of Kansas, in place of Frank J. Brettle. Incumbent's commission expired December 12, 1903.

LOUISIANA.

Albert H. Bassett to be postmaster at Kentwood, in the parish of Tangipahoa and State of Louisiana. Office became Presidential October 1, 1903.

Ernest A. Dupont to be postmaster at Houma, in the parish of Terrebonne and State of Louisiana, in place of John M. Haggerty. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1903.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Everett I. Nye to be postmaster at Wellfleet, in the county of Barnstable and State of Massachusetts. Office became Presidential July 1, 1903.

MICHIGAN.

Charles Bidwell, jr., to be postmaster at Tecumseh, in the county of Lenawee and State of Michigan, in place of Charles Bidwell, deceased.

Willard E. Holt to be postmaster at Bellevue, in the county of Eaton and State of Michigan, in place of Willard E. Holt. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1903.

NEBRASKA.

George B. Guffy to be postmaster at Elgin, in the county of Antelope and State of Nebraska. Office became Presidential April 1, 1903.

NEW YORK.

Harry M. Glen to be postmaster at Seneca Falls, in the county of Seneca and State of New York, in place of Harry M. Glen. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1903.

De Witt C. Titus to be postmaster at Hempstead, in the county of Nassau and State of New York, in place of De Witt C. Titus. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1903.

NORTH DAKOTA.

Walter A. Stafford to be postmaster at Velva, in the county of McHenry and State of North Dakota. Office became Presidential October 1, 1903.

Jared C. Thompson to be postmaster at Dickinson, in the county of Stark and State of North Dakota, in place of Jared C. Thompson. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1903.

OHIO.

William P. Gillam to be postmaster at Nevada, in the county of Wyandot and State of Ohio. Office became Presidential October 1, 1902.

Vernie E. Humphrey to be postmaster at Fayette, in the county of Fulton and State of Ohio, in place of Vernie E. Humphrey. Incumbent's commission expired December 12, 1903.

Charles W. Jones to be postmaster at Waverly, in the county of Pike and State of Ohio, in place of Charles W. Jones. Incumbent's commission expired December 12, 1903.

Robert S. King to be postmaster at Glouster, in the county of Athens and State of Ohio, in place of Robert S. King. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1903.

David H. Perrin to be postmaster at Maumee, in the county of Lucas and State of Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1903.

Charles B. Saxby to be postmaster at Weston, in the county of Wood and State of Ohio, in place of Charles B. Saxby. Incumbent's commission expired December 12, 1903.

Nellie F. Sheridan to be postmaster at Somers, in the county of Perry and State of Ohio, in place of Nellie F. Sheridan. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1903.

OREGON.

William M. Yates to be postmaster at Hood River, in the county of Wasco and State of Oregon, in place of William M. Yates. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1903.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Robert S. Bowman to be postmaster at Berwick, in the county of Columbia and State of Pennsylvania, in place of Robert S. Bowman. Incumbent's commission expires December 20, 1903.

John M. Chase, jr., to be postmaster at Clearfield, in the county of Clearfield and State of Pennsylvania, in place of John M. Chase, jr. Incumbent's commission expired February 14, 1903.

Julius L. Malcolm to be postmaster at Uniontown, in the county of Fayette and State of Pennsylvania, in place of Clarence H. Beall. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1903.

Gustavus C. Schrink to be postmaster at Pottsville, in the county of Schuylkill and State of Pennsylvania, in place of Gustavus C. Schrink. Incumbent's commission expired December 12, 1903.

RHODE ISLAND.

John A. Allen to be postmaster at Peace Dale, in the county of Washington and State of Rhode Island, in place of John A. Allen. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1903.

William M. Gorhan to be postmaster at Bristol, in the county of Bristol and State of Rhode Island, in place of William M. Gorhan. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1903.

Benjamin B. Martin to be postmaster at Warren, in the county of Bristol and State of Rhode Island, in place of Benjamin B. Martin. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1903.

SOUTH DAKOTA.

Charles F. Allen to be postmaster at Brookings, in the county of Brookings and State of South Dakota, in place of Reuben Matson. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1903.

VIRGINIA.

Benjamin P. Gay to be postmaster at Smithfield, in the county of Isle of Wight and State of Virginia, in place of Benjamin P. Gay. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1903.

WEST VIRGINIA.

John B. McNally to be postmaster at Wellsburg, in the county of Brooke and State of West Virginia, in place of John B. McNally. Incumbent's commission expired December 12, 1903.

WISCONSIN.

Ralph E. Arnold to be postmaster at Fairchild, in the county of Eau Claire and State of Wisconsin, in place of Ralph E. Arnold. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1903.

George W. Dodge to be postmaster at Menasha, in the county of Winnebago and State of Wisconsin, in place of George W. Dodge. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1903.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 17, 1903.

ENVOY EXTRAORDINARY AND MINISTER PLENIPOTENTIARY.

William J. Buchanan, of New York, to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States to Panama.

ASSISTANT TREASURER.

Thomas J. Akins, of Missouri, to be assistant treasurer of the United States at St. Louis, Mo.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REVENUE-CUTTER SERVICE.

First Asst. Engineer Carl M. Green to be a chief engineer with the rank of first lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

Second Asst. Engineer Edwin W. Davis to be a first assistant engineer with the rank of second lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

REGISTER OF LAND OFFICE.

Cornelius N. Van Hosen, of Springfield, Mo., to be register of the land office at Springfield, Mo.

RECEIVERS OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

Daniel J. Foley, of Eureka, Cal., to be receiver of public moneys at Eureka, Cal.

Fred Butler, of Colorado, to be receiver of public moneys at Leadville, Colo.

Thomas V. McAllister, of Vicksburg, Miss., to be receiver of public moneys at Jackson, Miss.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY.

Judge-Advocate-General's Department.

Capt. Francis H. Schoeffel, Ninth Infantry, to be judge-advocate with the rank of major, December 2, 1903.

Capt. John S. Grisard, Seventh Infantry, to be judge-advocate with the rank of major.

First Lieut. Blanton Winship, Sixteenth Infantry, to be judge-advocate with the rank of major.

Cavalry Arm.

Second Lieut. Charles W. Stewart, Nineteenth Infantry, to be second lieutenant of cavalry, with rank from October 9, 1903.

Second Lieut. Emil Engel, Nineteenth Infantry, to be second lieutenant of cavalry, with rank from October 9, 1903.

Second Lieut. Emmett Addis, Twentieth Infantry, to be second lieutenant of cavalry, with rank from October 9, 1903.

Second Lieut. Harry L. King, Twelfth Infantry, to be second lieutenant of cavalry, with rank from October 9, 1903.

Second Lieut. Arthur G. Hixson, Eighth Infantry, to be second lieutenant of cavalry, with rank from October 10, 1903.

PROMOTION IN THE ARMY.

Pay Department.

Capt. George T. Holloway, paymaster, to be paymaster with the rank of major, November 30, 1903.

POSTMASTERS.

ALASKA.

William B. Sampson to be postmaster at Skagway, Alaska.

CONNECTICUT.

Edmund E. Crowe to be postmaster at South Norwalk, in the county of Fairfield and State of Connecticut.

George E. Schofield to be postmaster at Greenwich, in the county of Fairfield and State of Connecticut.

Rufus H. Seymour to be postmaster at Ridgefield, in the county of Fairfield and State of Connecticut.

ILLINOIS.

Putnam Beckwith to be postmaster at Wenona, in the county of Marshall and State of Illinois.

William E. Cummings to be postmaster at Highwood, in the county of Lake and State of Illinois.

Thomas S. Green to be postmaster at Gardner, in the county of Grundy and State of Illinois.

William Hawley to be postmaster at Dundee, in the county of Kane and State of Illinois.

David Herriott to be postmaster at Morgan Park, in the county of Cook and State of Illinois.

Horace H. Peaslee to be postmaster at Naperville, in the county of Du Page and State of Illinois.

Richard R. Puffer to be postmaster at Odell, in the county of Livingston and State of Illinois.

Harry E. Spear to be postmaster at Polo, in the county of Ogle and State of Illinois.

David F. Wilcox to be postmaster at Quincy, in the county of Adams and State of Illinois.

INDIANA.

John C. Row to be postmaster at Osgood, in the county of Ripley and State of Indiana.

IOWA.

Cornelius C. Platter to be postmaster at Red Oak, in the county of Montgomery and State of Iowa.

Charles A. Reynolds to be postmaster at Harlan, in the county of Shelby and State of Iowa.

Lovett E. Sherwood to be postmaster at Shellrock, in the county of Butler and State of Iowa.

KANSAS.

Joseph S. Stone to be postmaster at Burrton, in the county of Harvey and State of Kansas.

KENTUCKY.

Thomas Boggess, jr., to be postmaster at Ashland, in the county of Boyd and State of Kentucky.

George W. Hutcheson to be postmaster at Lawrenceburg, in the county of Anderson and State of Kentucky.

Ethel E. Johnson to be postmaster at Vanceburg, in the county of Lewis and State of Kentucky.

Will P. Scott to be postmaster at Dawsonsprings, in the county of Hopkins and State of Kentucky.

MICHIGAN.

Charles H. Baird to be postmaster at Holly, in the county of Oakland and State of Michigan.

Charles A. Cline to be postmaster at West Branch, in the county of Ogemaw and State of Michigan.

Archibald K. Dougherty to be postmaster at Elk Rapids, in the county of Antrim and State of Michigan.

William McGillivray to be postmaster at Oscoda, in the county of Iosco and State of Michigan.

Hamilton A. Macklem to be postmaster at Marlette, in the county of Sanilac and State of Michigan.

Loren A. Sherman to be postmaster at Port Huron, in the county of St. Clair and State of Michigan.

Gerrit Van Schelven to be postmaster at Holland, in the county of Ottawa and State of Michigan.

MINNESOTA.

Charles W. Paige to be postmaster at Dawson, in the county of Lac qui Parle and State of Minnesota.

Raleigh M. Pope to be postmaster at Mora, in the county of Kanabec and State of Minnesota.

Charles F. Searle to be postmaster at Milaca, in the county of Millelacs and State of Minnesota.

MISSOURI.

J. W. S. Dillon to be postmaster at Grant City, in the county of Worth and State of Missouri.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

Lewis W. Davis to be postmaster at East Jaffrey, in the county of Cheshire and State of New Hampshire.

NEW YORK.

Stephen P. Barker to be postmaster at Richfield Springs, in the county of Otsego and State of New York.

Henry R. Bryan to be postmaster at Hudson, in the county of Columbia and State of New York.

George D. Davis to be postmaster at Mount Kisco, in the county of Westchester and State of New York.

George T. Eveland to be postmaster at Franklin, in the county of Delaware and State of New York.

Alonzo E. Hadley to be postmaster at Springville, in the county of Erie and State of New York.

Charles C. Johnson to be postmaster at Antwerp, in the county of Jefferson and State of New York.

Aloysius McArdle to be postmaster at Victorhill (late West Seneca), in the county of Erie and State of New York.

Elbert E. Makepeace to be postmaster at Alexandria Bay, in the county of Jefferson and State of New York.

George E. Marcellus to be postmaster at Le Roy, in the county of Genesee and State of New York.

Warren J. Martin to be postmaster at Port Chester, in the county of Westchester and State of New York.

Charles G. Norton to be postmaster at Bainbridge, in the county of Chenango and State of New York.

Lillian I. Pearsall to be postmaster at Sea Cliff, in the county of Nassau and State of New York.

Webster M. Richardson to be postmaster at Mexico, in the county of Oswego and State of New York.

Willard F. Sherwood to be postmaster at Hornellsville, in the county of Steuben and State of New York.

Orlando W. Sutton to be postmaster at Bath, in the county of Steuben and State of New York.

Mortimer R. Tefft to be postmaster at Greenwich, in the county of Washington and State of New York.

OHIO.

Chandler W. Carroll to be postmaster at St. Clairsville, in the county of Belmont and State of Ohio.

Andrew J. Heinlein to be postmaster at Bridgeport, in the county of Belmont and State of Ohio.

Robert C. Stewart to be postmaster at Toronto, in the county of Jefferson and State of Ohio.

OKLAHOMA.

Elta H. Jayne to be postmaster at Edmond, in the county of Oklahoma and Territory of Oklahoma.

Thomas J. Palmer to be postmaster at Medford, in the county of Grant and Territory of Oklahoma.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Julius L. Malcolm to be postmaster at Uniontown, in the State of Pennsylvania.

TENNESSEE.

William O. Douglas to be postmaster at Jellico, in the county of Campbell and State of Tennessee.

TEXAS.

Henry T. Vaughan to be postmaster at Mart, in the county of McLennan and State of Texas.

VERMONT.

Martha W. Arnold to be postmaster at Bethel, in the county of Windsor and State of Vermont.

Henry G. Blanchard to be postmaster at Newport, in the county of Orleans and State of Vermont.

VIRGINIA.

S. W. Tardy to be postmaster at Buena Vista, in the county of Rockbridge and State of Virginia.

WEST VIRGINIA.

William H. Glover to be postmaster at Terra Alta, in the county of Preston and State of West Virginia.

WISCONSIN.

John F. Gillmore to be postmaster at Durand, in the county of Pepin and State of Wisconsin.

WYOMING.

William H. Dobson to be postmaster at Newcastle, in the county of Weston and State of Wyoming.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, December 17, 1903.

The House met at 12 o'clock m.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. VAN VOORHIS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 6758, being the pension appropriation bill.

Mr. HAMILTON. I hope the gentleman will withhold his motion for a moment, in order that I may have an opportunity to ask unanimous consent for the consideration of a bill which has been reported unanimously by the Committee on the Territories, granting permission to the people of certain towns in Arizona to bond themselves for the construction of a freight and wagon road.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Ohio withhold his motion temporarily?

Mr. VAN VOORHIS. I withhold the motion.

SALT RIVER VALLEY FREIGHTING AND WAGON ROAD.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 7273) to enable the city of Phoenix, the town of Tempe, and the town of Mesa, all in Maricopa County, Ariz., severally to issue the bonds of said municipalities for the purpose of aiding in the construction of a freighting and wagon road from any convenient point in the Salt River Valley to the Salt River reservoir dam site in Maricopa County, Ariz.

The bill was read at length.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BURKETT. Reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman a question or two. First, has the Government been heard in connection with the consideration of this bill by the committee?

Mr. HAMILTON. The Government has been heard in this, that the Director of the Geological Survey, who under the national irrigation act has supervision of the construction of the dam of the Salt River Valley, in Arizona, has been consulted by the committee, and the committee have been advised by him quite fully in the premises.

Mr. BURKETT. Has he been before the committee?

Mr. HAMILTON. No. The committee has quite fully informed itself, however, in relation to it, and the committee has taken testimony in relation to the construction of this dam.

Mr. BURKETT. What is the Government proposing to do in connection with this?

Mr. HAMILTON. The Government is proposing, under the national irrigation law, to construct a dam on the Salt River Valley, in Arizona, at a point half a mile west of where the Tonto Creek flows into Salt River. That dam will be 200 feet across the bottom and about 800 feet across the top, 188 feet thick at the base, 16 feet thick at the top, and 280 feet high from bed rock. The dam so constructed will impound 1,480,000 acre-feet of water. This reservoir will be 25 miles long, with an average width of 1 mile to a mile and a half.

Mr. BURKETT. The gentleman does not understand my question. What does the Government propose to do with reference to this road?

Mr. HAMILTON. As to the construction of the road, this dam at the point where it is proposed to construct it will be 75 miles east of the city of Phoenix, and the only means of reaching the dam site at present is, first, by way of what is known as the Reno Pass, a way which is a mere rough mountain trail, dangerous to man or horse, reaching an altitude of a little over 5,000 feet; and, second, by rail and by stage, a distance of about 400 miles, 45 miles of that distance being from Globe to the dam site by stage.

Now, the Government must have a means of transportation for the poles and wire necessary to be used in the transmission of electric power from the dam to the valley of Salt River, which it is proposed to irrigate by the construction of this dam and reservoir; hence the Government finds it necessary to construct a rough way over Superstition Mountains and at least as far as Goldfields.

To do this will cost the Government, in connection with this enterprise, the sum of \$25,000. Now, it is proposed by the citizens of these three towns—Phoenix, Mesa, and Tempe—to bond themselves by a two-thirds vote to raise money to construct a wagon and freight road from Phoenix to this dam site. The Government of the United States puts \$25,000 into it in carrying out this irrigation enterprise. These towns supplement that by bonding themselves, so as to make a safe freight and wagon road. That road will be only 75 miles long.

Mr. BURKETT. I asked the gentleman what the Government proposed to do?

Mr. HAMILTON. It proposes to put \$25,000 into the construction of the road.

Mr. BURKETT. Where did the committee get that proposition from?

Mr. PAYNE. Let me ask the gentleman, do they not propose that the Government put in \$50,000 if this bill passes and the bonds issue and the money is raised?

Mr. BURKETT. Does not this bill look toward the proposition that the Government shall put enough money into it to build the road, whatever it is?

Mr. HAMILTON. Oh, no.

Mr. BURKETT. Isn't that the proposition—if they will bond themselves for this amount the Government will see the road built?

Mr. HAMILTON. That is not the purpose at all.

Mr. PAYNE. Let me read from the report of the committee.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. The Government offers \$25,000 additional in case the hundred thousand dollars is raised. Perhaps that is what the gentleman alludes to.

Mr. BURKETT. The Government makes this proposition: That if they will bind themselves for 2 per cent, which takes them above the 4 per cent as provided by law—

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Slightly above.

Mr. BURKETT. Two and one-tenth above—that the Government will put in whatever is necessary if assured that this road will be built. Is not that about the proposition?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. The \$25,000 comes out of the reclamation fund.

Mr. BURKETT. Oh, it all comes out of the reclamation fund.

Mr. HAMILTON. The gentleman is mistaken about that; it does not all come out of the reclamation fund.

Mr. BURKETT. All but what the citizens raise.

Mr. HAMILTON. Certainly, but the citizens raise enough to construct the road. The Federal Government does not propose to make a continuous road. There is a precipice near Fish Creek a thousand feet high. The Government does not propose to con-

struct its road over that, but to carry the poles and wire from each way, as I understand. The Government constructs road enough to carry out the irrigation enterprise and only puts \$25,000 into it. But it is stated that the Government will save money by putting \$25,000 more into the enterprise if the citizens will construct the road.

Mr. BURKETT. Has the committee had any representative of the Government before it to show what the cost of the road will be?

Mr. METCALF. Perhaps I may be able to answer the gentleman. Mr. Newell says that it will cost \$100,000 to construct the road into the Tonto basin. They have got to take in all their supplies and machinery for constructing it. It seems to me that the proposed grant is in the interest of the Government.

Mr. POWERS of Maine. Those that appeared before the committee said that the proposed cost of the road would be about a hundred thousand dollars. The parties representing the town before the committee assured us that the hundred thousand dollars would build the road. The citizens of these towns are to bond themselves by a two-thirds vote of the taxpayers. They desire this road so much that they are ready to bond themselves to the extent of 2 per cent of the last valuation.

Mr. BURKETT. Let me ask the gentleman a question. I have gone through all the printed hearings on this matter, and I have not found any suggestion or intimation of any less cost than \$100,000. Furthermore, so far as I have been able to consult with Mr. Newell, there is, as I gather, no expectation that this road will cost less than \$150,000; and they can not tell how much it is going to cost to build through that mountainous pass for a dozen miles, as they will have to do.

Furthermore, if the road is going to cost less than \$100,000, these cities already have under the law a right to bond themselves, as I have figured out, according to their own statements, to the amount of about \$86,000. They can raise \$86,000 without any special act of Congress.

Now, if this road is going to cost less than \$100,000, and the Government is willing to put in \$25,000, as seems to be brought out in the hearings, what is the necessity for the passage of this bill?

Mr. POWERS of Maine. I will answer the gentleman. I did not say that this road was to cost less. I said simply that the representatives of the city of Phoenix, who came before us, when asked by me (I do not know what may be said in the record) as to the necessity of bonding to the extent of \$100,000, replied that on the reports they had that sum would certainly enable the road to be built, and they hoped to do it for a much less sum.

I asked him about the Government furnishing \$50,000. He told me it would cost the Government \$25,000 for the building of this road, which sum would be necessary for getting the poles and the wires; but that such an arrangement would not be a very convenient one; that it would be very much more convenient for the Government in building this large dam to have a good road; that he believed (though he said he did not care to be responsible for making that statement positively) that if the Government would contribute \$25,000 more toward the enterprise the cities would take care of the rest.

Mr. BURKETT. Allow me to ask the gentleman whether in the committee, in response to a question something like the gentleman has said he asked, this was not said. I read from the report:

That part from Goldfields—

Which I understand is the edge of the valley. Of the 75 miles of road to be constructed, about 40 will go across the valley, which will not be very expensive; the remaining 35 will go through the mountains—

That part from Goldfields to the dam site will lie through the Superstition Mountains for a distance of 34 miles, and in the construction of it many engineering difficulties will have to be overcome, among them that at Fish Creek, where a sheer precipice of over 1,000 feet will have to be gotten over.

So much the gentleman has suggested. The report continues:

There are 11 miles of the proposed road near Fish Creek which engineers estimate will cost \$100,000 to construct.

Mr. POWERS of Maine. Let me say to the gentleman that that is the difficulty in the case. With this \$25,000 we should have about \$125,000.

Further, I fail to see in this bill anywhere anything that commits the Government to the expenditure of one cent in building this road.

It simply allows the people of these towns and cities to aid the Government in the building of the road. It does not commit the Government to do anything.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Allow me to put a question to the gentleman in charge of this bill. I should like to know whether the amount which is to be expended here is to come out of the Treasury of the United States, or whether it comes from the reclamation fund?

Mr. HAMILTON. The \$25,000 comes from the reclamation fund which the people benefited by irrigation restore to the Government. The rest of it is all raised by the bonds proposed here to be issued.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. What I want to know is, clearly and distinctly, whether the money which is to be appropriated for the construction of this road comes from the funds received from the sale of lands, and which under the bill passed a year or two ago were set aside for irrigation purposes.

Mr. HAMILTON. Oh, no.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. It does not?

Mr. HAMILTON. No; not at all.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Then it can come from but one source, and I will have to object to the bill.

Mr. HAMILTON. Let me make myself understood. The bill proposes to allow certain towns—namely, Phoenix, Tempe, and Mesa—to bond themselves by a two-thirds vote to raise money for the construction of a certain road 75 miles long.

Now, that is an independent, separate proposition of itself, in which the Government is not concerned; but it supplements the Government operations to this extent, that the Government in the construction of its dam of the Salt River at Tonto Creek must necessarily expend \$25,000 in the construction a road over which to carry its poles and wires. The citizens simply want to follow that trail with a perfect road. That is all there is to it. It does not cost the Government of the United States anything. This levies no charge upon the Government. I would further state that this is a unanimous report of the Committee on Territories.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. What I would like to know is this: Is the Government involved in any expense whatever—

Mr. HAMILTON. None.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Upon this proposition over and above the amount which would naturally become a part of the construction of the dam and come from the reclamation fund?

Mr. HAMILTON. Not one cent.

Mr. PAYNE. I would state, if the gentleman from Michigan will permit me, that that question is answered in the report, and I will read from the report.

Mr. HAMILTON. Very well. It will not cost one cent.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. I withdraw my objection, if that is the case.

Mr. PAYNE. The report says:

For the purpose of the construction merely of the transmission and telephone lines, above mentioned, by the Federal Government from the dam site to Phoenix, the Government will have to spend not less than \$25,000, and the Government, through the Director of the Geological Survey, proposes, if the freight and wagon road sought to be constructed by this bill is built, to increase the sum of \$25,000, which it would otherwise expend in the construction of a mere rough way for the purpose of conveying poles and wires in the construction of its power and electric lines before mentioned, to \$50,000, which sum is to be expended from the reclamation fund under the national irrigation act, the Government reimbursing itself for its expenditure upon said road and its expenditure for such dam and reservoir in accordance with the provisions of said act.

Mr. BURKETT. Let me make another suggestion, and then the gentleman can answer them both. Right in connection with what the report has said and in answer to the suggestion of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL], let me also say that in the hearings of Mr. Fowler, who was here to represent those towns, this statement is made—

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. I will state that the chairman of the committee told the gentleman from Nebraska a moment ago that it did not come out of the reclamation fund.

Mr. BURKETT. That the estimated cost of the transmission road is \$25,000. In addition to that, the Government proposes to put in \$25,000 more than the cost of the mere transmission roads, or, in other words, in round numbers, to bear one-third of the entire estimated cost of the freight and wagon road, providing the towns will put in the other two-thirds.

Mr. HAMILTON. Now, will the gentleman permit me to make that clear?

Mr. BURKETT. Yes, that is the object of asking the question.

Mr. HAMILTON. Now, the Government proposes to put the \$25,000 into the construction of this rough way for the carriage of poles and wire. This is necessary in connection with the irrigation project. The Government has not said it will add \$25,000 to this, but it may do it. It is hoped that it may do it and it ought to do it. After this dam is constructed, first, there will be a large number of people employed upon the construction of that dam and it will be necessary to get people who might be injured in the construction of the dam to hospitals as rapidly as possible. It would be a great hardship to take them 400 miles around by rail and stage or to take them 110 miles around Reno Pass on horseback. There ought to be a road across there.

Next, there are 15,000 tons of structural steel and other material necessary to be used in the construction of that dam. It is necessary that that material shall be transported over some road, for in the construction of the dam the Government has got to have

it. It is a simple business proposition. If the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BURKETT] wants to save the Government any money, the way to save it is by the construction of a road there which will enable the Government to carry its material and supplies for the men employed there by a short road from Phoenix down to this dam site. The Government could well afford to put \$25,000 more in there, if it chose to do it, simply to cheapen the cost of construction of that dam. It is money in the Treasury of the United States to do so. The Government is not bound to do so. It is tentative; it is simply a suggestion. There is no reason why we should be alarmed about that additional \$25,000.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. I would ask the gentleman if the proposed construction of this road is a part of the irrigation scheme.

Mr. HAMILTON. No; only to this extent—

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. Is it absolutely necessary in order to promote that scheme of irrigation to have this road constructed?

Mr. HAMILTON. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. And therefore it is proposed to take the \$25,000 out of the irrigation fund?

Mr. HAMILTON. To the extent of \$25,000.

Mr. NEEDHAM. That is all paid back.

Mr. OLMSTED. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HAMILTON. Yes.

Mr. OLMSTED. Mr. Speaker, according to the statement of the gentleman from Michigan, this bill proposes to dam Salt River. Now, as there is a political party represented here upon the other side of this Chamber which, by its attacks upon the tariff and upon the course of the Government in the Panama matter, is preparing to take a notable trip up that river next year, I should like to ask the gentleman from Michigan if the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] has been consulted on this matter? [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. HAMILTON. I assume that the gentlemen on the minority side of the committee have consulted the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS]. I understand that the minority of the committee are perfectly satisfied with the bill. I want to say this to my friend from Nebraska [Mr. BURKETT], that the bill was first considered by the committee as a whole. Next it was referred to a subcommittee, which gave it careful consideration. It was referred back to the full committee and some amendments were made to the bill, which was given the most careful consideration by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. LLOYD], the gentleman from Maine [Mr. POWERS], and myself, acting as a subcommittee. The committee feel very well satisfied that this is an enterprise to which the Government ought to lend its sanction.

Next, I want to supplement the statement of my friend from Maine [Mr. POWERS] in respect to these bonds. He made a statement in response to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BURKETT] in regard to the amount. These towns are able to raise almost the amount necessary under the 4 per cent limitation. Authority by this Government to these towns to bond themselves would give the bonds a certain standing in the market which they might not otherwise have. It does not cost the Government anything.

Mr. PAYNE. I should like to ask the gentleman a question, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HAMILTON. Yes.

Mr. PAYNE. I understand that under the present law these towns can bond themselves for \$86,000, a sum within \$14,000 of the one hundred thousand?

Mr. HAMILTON. That is the estimate of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BURKETT].

Mr. BURKETT. Those are the figures in the report, not anybody's estimate.

Mr. PAYNE. Now, this looks to me as though this came in here to get the sanction of Congress in the initiative, in the hope that if the \$150,000 was not enough to build this road Congress would be asked to go on with this dam site and other improvements there, just as we have been compelled in other instances, where Congress gave a very little recognition to some scheme, to come in to save it, or at the end to pay the debts of an exposition, or something of that kind, in order to save the credit of the Government. It looks to me as though that might be the object, instead of trying to get some sanction to issue these bonds, because the Government has already given sanction to the bonds.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there are not ten men on the floor of this House outside of the coterie standing over there who know what is under consideration. [Applause.] I submit that we ought to have a chance to know.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. The point of order made by the gentleman from Minnesota is well taken. The House will be in order.

Mr. POWERS of Maine. One moment, if the gentleman will

permit me. I wish to say to the gentleman from New York that I made a similar suggestion to Mr. Fowler about their being able to raise this amount of money without getting any special legislation. He said they might want more than the 4 per cent, but whether they did or did not, if he took these bonds to New York to sell, and he had an act of Congress showing the right to issue them, that there could be no question about it, that he would have no difficulty in selling them; and for that reason all these municipalities desire permission, by a two-thirds vote of the taxpayers, to tax themselves or bond themselves to this extent. It seems to me to be a reasonable and proper request, to the end that they might sell their bonds at a higher rate and pay less interest.

Mr. PAYNE. I want to ask the gentleman from Maine a question.

Mr. POWERS of Maine. Yes.

Mr. PAYNE. Have not these towns already authority to issue bonds to the extent of 2 per cent?

Mr. POWERS of Maine. I was explaining that.

Mr. PAYNE. Have not they got that power now?

Mr. POWERS of Maine. They have.

Mr. PAYNE. What higher legality and what higher value does it give to the bond if the Government puts itself in the attitude of allowing these towns to bond themselves for \$14,000 more?

Mr. POWERS of Maine. I will answer; because the gentleman knows, as he has had more to do with bonds than I have, that when they take these bonds to New York to sell, the first question that would be asked would be, "What authority have you to issue the bonds?" If they take them there under this special act of Congress authorizing them to issue the bonds, with the statement as to the amount of the last valuation, and showing that it is within the 2 per cent limit, then they could readily sell their bonds.

Mr. PAYNE. Why, by the general act they are allowed to issue bonds to 2 per cent of the assessed value of the property. How would they know that that was not overrunning the per cent?

Mr. POWERS of Maine. They would have to make an examination in order to show it. They undertake to tax themselves; they desire their bonds to sell at the lowest possible price; and therefore they ask the privilege of having this act under which to issue the bonds; and I think they ought to have it.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I am in full sympathy with some of the objections that have been raised by the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. HAMILTON. I ask for order, that the gentleman may be heard.

The SPEAKER. The House will be in order.

Mr. MONDELL. I am in full accord with the gentleman from Nebraska with regard to some of the objections which he has urged to the bill. I think, however, that the bill, if considered, could easily be amended so as to overcome those objections.

It seems to me the only possible objectionable feature of the bill is contained in the paragraph relative to the use of the funds that are to be raised by the sale of the bonds. I think there can be no possible objection on the part of any Member of the House to giving the citizens of these municipalities the right to bond themselves for the construction of a wagon road. But the bill should not contain any provision which, by any possibility, could be construed as extending the power or authority of the Secretary of the Interior, under the irrigation law, to expend the irrigation fund. I believe if the bill when considered were amended by striking out certain words, so that it would provide simply that the funds arising from the sale of bonds should be used in the construction of a freight and wagon road between the points referred to, then there can be no objection to the bill.

As the bill now reads I think there is some ground for this fear that it might be construed to authorize the use of a sufficient sum from the irrigation fund to complete the road in question; in other words, to use more than was necessary for purposes directly or necessarily in connection with irrigation work. I am delighted on this occasion to note how carefully the irrigation fund is being guarded by the gentlemen who voted against it, as well as by the friends of the fund.

I believe with the amendment suggested the people of these three municipalities can use \$100,000 for the purpose of making a road of the trail, which the Government must of necessity build in order to construct this dam. We should remember that this is not the only road from the Salt River dam site, and that a large portion of the material, if I am correctly informed, will come in from another direction. But the Salt River Valley and the communities on Salt River are the communities to be benefited by this irrigation.

Mr. HAMILTON. And they pay the freight.

Mr. MONDELL. The water that is to be conserved on Salt River is to be used in the vicinity of these municipalities. The

people of that locality must repay to the Government the approximately \$8,000,000 that the works will cost.

Mr. HAMILTON. Within ten years.

Mr. MONDELL. In addition to this, they now propose to tax themselves for the purpose of making a better road between the dam and the towns than it would be necessary for the Government to construct in order to carry on the work.

There certainly can be no objection to that being done, provided there be nothing in the bill suggesting that the Government is bound to the completion of a "practical" freight road, and that that sum necessary can be taken out of the irrigation fund. If the amendment I suggest is made, then the bill simply provides for the bonding of these three municipalities for the purpose of constructing a wagon road. If they desire to do so, we ought to give them the power and authority to do it.

This is a necessary purpose, and I think we ought to give them the authority asked for in the bill, with the amendments that will remove all doubt as to any responsibility on the part of the Government for the completion of the road to an extent not necessary for Governmental purposes; and, in that connection, I think the bill should be amended in the last section so that the fund shall be expended entirely under the direction of the municipalities. In that way expenditure is entirely divorced from the work of the Federal Government in connection with irrigation work. This bill provides that it shall be expended under the direction of the Director of the Geological Survey. Certainly if expended in this way it will be expended economically and to the best advantage. This provision is open to the objection, however, that it might be construed to connect the Government with the betterment of this road by the people of Salt River Valley, and, therefore, that provision should be amended so that the expenditure of the fund shall remain in the hands of the municipalities. If the people themselves conclude to have the Government reclamation engineers, under the Director of the Geological Survey, direct and superintend the expenditure they can of course do so, and if they are wise they will so arrange it.

Mr. HAMILTON. I think the committee will agree to that.

Mr. HEPBURN. I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Michigan yield to the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. HAMILTON. Certainly.

Mr. HEPBURN. I would like to ask if, in the gentleman's opinion, it is competent for the officers in charge of this reclamation fund to expend \$50,000 in constructing this highway—

Mr. HAMILTON. It is not a highway.

Mr. HEPBURN (continuing). If they deem it an auxiliary or aid to the construction of the dam?

Mr. HAMILTON. They construe the expenditure of this money for the construction of this road as a part of the reclamation enterprise, and as necessary. The gentleman will perceive that in a very mountainous country—

Mr. HEPBURN. I want to get the gentleman's opinion if they have a right to do it.

Mr. HAMILTON. That is the committee's construction of it, and it is my construction.

Mr. HEPBURN. Then if they should conclude that they can secure some other method that would be better than the highway, would they have a right to construct that, if it was clearly better? For instance, if they may build a highway, may they not build a trolley road if they conclude that it is necessary?

Mr. HAMILTON. No.

Mr. HEPBURN. Why not?

Mr. HAMILTON. Because the Government can only proceed so far as necessary in the enterprise.

Mr. HEPBURN. Who determines the necessity?

Mr. HAMILTON. It is a plain and reasonable necessity. They must have poles and wires to connect the dam with the valley.

Mr. HEPBURN. This is reclamation by electricity? [Laughter.]

Mr. HAMILTON. I did not quite catch what the gentleman said; but this is an electric age, and no one knows it better than the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. POWERS of Maine. Let me say to the gentleman that in this scheme of irrigation there is only one way, in accordance with the scheme, that has been devised, and that is to build this dam and then send the water to the valley and pump it up by means of the power generated at this dam.

Mr. HEPBURN. You get it down and then get it up?

Mr. POWERS of Maine. And this electric power is to be transmitted by wires and poles along this road. That is the scheme as devised by the engineers in charge.

Mr. HEPBURN. Now, will the gentleman answer the question that I put to the chairman of the committee? Is it a matter of discretion on the part of those in charge of this work to determine what will facilitate the work?

Mr. POWERS of Maine. I apprehend it is.

Mr. HEPBURN. And it is under that rule that they have a right to appropriate \$50,000 for the purpose?

Mr. POWERS of Maine. I will answer the gentleman if I understand it.

Mr. HEPBURN. Suppose they determine that there is another method that will facilitate the enterprise. Have they a right to determine that—as, for instance, a trolley road?

Mr. POWERS of Maine. In building the dam they must have some method of getting in and of getting out.

Mr. HEPBURN. And they determine the method?

Mr. POWERS of Maine. This scheme for irrigating the Salt River Valley contemplates the transmission of this power through that valley.

Mr. HEPBURN. I wish the gentleman would be ingenuous.

Mr. POWERS of Maine. And anything that is necessary and proper—

Mr. HEPBURN. "Anything that is necessary and proper." Now, if they should determine that they could get greater facilities by a common railway, have they the power to construct that in preference to a trolley?

Mr. POWERS of Maine. I do not apprehend they would attempt it.

Mr. HEPBURN. Have they the power; and if not, why not?

Mr. POWERS of Maine. Simply because I think a careful examination would show that that is not a necessary adjunct of the system.

Mr. HEPBURN. Who is to determine the necessity?

Mr. POWERS of Maine. The scheme already adopted and being put in force has determined the necessity of transmitting this power by electric wire, and I suppose that is admitted.

Mr. HEMENWAY. I desire to ask the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HAMILTON] whether he will not yield—

Mr. HAMILTON. I was about to yield to the gentleman from Nebraska for a suggestion.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Probably that suggestion is the same as mine, which is that this bill go back to the committee to be perfected and brought up again to-morrow. I must object unless gentlemen agree to take the bill and perfect it on the lines suggested by the gentleman from Iowa, and I think that had better be done in committee and the bill be brought back again to-morrow. We can not here on the floor of the House, in a hurry, go over this bill as we ought to go over it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HEMENWAY] objects.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the following resolution:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That when the two Houses adjourn on Saturday, December 19, they stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian Monday, January 4, 1904.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the bill (H. R. 1921) to carry into effect a convention between the United States and the Republic of Cuba, signed on the 11th day of December, in the year 1902.

PENSION APPROPRIATION BILL.

On motion of Mr. VAN VOORHIS, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union (Mr. OLMSTED in the chair) and resumed the consideration of the pension appropriation bill.

Mr. VAN VOORHIS. I yield thirty minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCOTT].

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, it requires but a casual acquaintance with the political history of our country to disclose the strong predilection of the Democratic party for claiming the authorship of measures which in their inception it opposed, but which in their development and operation have become successful and popular.

This peculiar Democratic attribute of out-Heroding Herod in the support of that which it first opposed finds a striking illustration in the attitude of that party toward Republican leaders who have passed away. A former Speaker of this House once defined a statesman as a politician who is dead. If you will pardon the paraphrase I might describe with equal accuracy a Democratic hero as a Republican statesman who is dead.

On the spur of the moment I can not recall hearing on this floor any utterances more touching and pathetic than those with which our friends on the other side of the aisle have attested their veneration for the memory of Abraham Lincoln, although while he yet lived, while he was doing the deeds for which they now praise him, bearing the cross for which they now weep, the Democratic party, North as well as South, exhausted the vocabulary of vituperation in traducing and maligning and reviling him.

I bear willing witness also that during the two years in which I have been a Member of this House references to the wise words

and the patriotic acts and the pure motives of William McKinley have been hardly less frequent on that side of the Chamber than on this. And the other day my friend from Georgia, I believe—perhaps it was the gentleman from Alabama—having occasion in the course of his remarks to speak the name of James G. Blaine, paused reverently to invoke the blessing of God upon his memory.

I do not allude to this strange Democratic peculiarity, Mr. Chairman, to criticise or condemn it. On the contrary, I applaud it. I believe that it is better to be right "in the cold gray dawn of the morning after," or forty years after, than never to be right at all; and since an all-wise Providence has apparently put it out of the power of the Democratic party to get right in the inception of any great public measure, I certainly can not find it in my heart to desire, even if I had the power, to rob it of whatever consolation may come from an eleventh-hour repentance. I can appreciate the motive, if I can not approve the morals, of a political organization which seeks to have its former opposition to a popular measure forgotten in the loud clamor of its present approbation.

But I believe that the historic verities should be preserved, and it is in the hope of contributing somewhat to that end that I venture to call the attention of the House to some of the official records touching the inauguration and establishment and development of our system of free rural delivery of mails.

In a colloquy the other day with the gentleman from Iowa several gentlemen on the other side made assertions which left the impression that the Democratic party was the author and finisher of this system of free rural mail delivery which has become so popular during the past few years. These gentlemen spoke on the spur of the moment and their mistake could therefore be easily pardoned, and yet it seems to me it ought not to pass without correction.

I apprehended that this sort of scheme would make its first appearance officially in the reports of the Postmasters-General of the United States. I have therefore examined these reports with some care and for some years back. The first reference which I find to this system appears in the report of the Hon. John Wanamaker, Postmaster-General during the Harrison Administration, in which he says:

My ideal for the American postal service is a system modeled upon a district plan, with fewer offices, and those grouped around central offices and under thorough supervision. By this means at least 20,000 offices could be abandoned that produce no revenue to the Department. In the place of every abolished nonmoney-order and nonregistry office might be put an automatic stamp-selling machine and a letter box to receive mail. With the money saved should be instituted a system of collection and delivery by mounted carriers, bicycles, and star-route and messenger contractors, and the free delivery gradually spread all over the country.

That is the first allusion I find to free rural delivery of mails.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. What report is that?

Mr. SCOTT. That is the report of 1892.

Mr. CANDLER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Kansas yield to the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. SCOTT. Yes.

Mr. CANDLER. I will ask the gentleman if he has examined the report of Postmaster-General Wilson in reference to a rural free delivery?

Mr. SCOTT. If the gentleman will bear with me, I will come to that further on in my remarks.

Mr. CANDLER. This is the fact, that a bill was passed establishing a rural free-delivery system during a Democratic Administration.

Mr. SCOTT. I will state that it is my purpose to take this up in an orderly manner, and the answer to the gentleman's question will appear when I reach the point to which he refers.

Mr. CANDLER. Was it not put into effect by the Postmaster-General under the Cleveland Administration?

Mr. SCOTT. I will show to the satisfaction of the gentleman just exactly when it was put into effect, under what Administration, and by whose orders.

Mr. CANDLER. Then I understand the gentleman will do that later in his speech?

Mr. SCOTT. That is my purpose, if the gentleman will be kind enough to permit me to proceed.

The recommendation which was made by Postmaster-General Wanamaker, and to which I have just alluded, was followed up by the Administration and resulted in an appropriation for experiments in the direction suggested. These experiments in the first place were in the nature of extending free delivery to villages and small towns. At the close of the Harrison Administration the experiments which had been set on foot under the direction of Mr. Wanamaker were proceeding with great satisfaction to the country and to the people, and propositions had been made to extend these systems still further so as to reach out into the rural regions. That was the situation which prevailed when a Democratic Administration, the second Cleveland Administration, came into power. Referring to this matter, the First Assistant Postmaster-

General under that Administration made the following report. After having discussed in a discouraging way the entire system, he says:

It would require an appropriation of at least \$20,000,000 to inaugurate a system of rural free delivery throughout the country.

Following the recommendation of the First Assistant, the Postmaster-General, Bissell, incorporated the following in his annual report:

Although it was provided by Congress in the appropriation bill for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1894, that \$10,000 should be devoted, at the discretion of the Postmaster-General, to testing the feasibility of establishing a system of free delivery in rural districts, it has been found impossible, by reason of the pressure of more important questions, for the officers having that subject in charge to give the subject the study and consideration that it demands, much less to establish such rural free delivery.

It was soon discovered, furthermore, that the appropriation for this experiment is not at all sufficient for thorough and reliable tests, for in order to give the rural free-delivery system a fair and thorough trial tests would have to be made in many localities differing necessarily in density of population, topography, class of interests, condition of highways and thoroughfares. To inaugurate a system of rural free delivery it would require an appropriation of at least \$20,000,000.

He then refers to the report of his First Assistant, and indorses the recommendation made there that the attempt be not made.

The next official reference which I find to this matter appears in the second report of William L. Wilson as Postmaster-General, in which he says, referring to the appropriation which had been made in the preceding year and which he had not used:

Should Congress see fit to make it available for the current year, I will make the experiment ordered by the best tests I can devise; but the difficulties in the way of such experiments and the reasons for viewing the whole plan as impracticable are fully set forth in the report of the House committee on the post-office appropriation bill, second session of the Fifty-third Congress.

It will be seen, therefore, that Mr. Cleveland's Postmaster-General, after two years of study and reflection upon the subject, after having absolutely refused to use the money which Congress placed at his disposal for this purpose, gave it as his opinion that the whole plan was impracticable and should be abandoned. The Postmaster-General, in the extract which I have just read, referred to the report on the appropriation bill in the Congress of that year. That report was made by the Hon. John B. Henderson, of North Carolina, who was at that time chairman of the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads, and in the course of that report, accompanying the appropriation bill, he says:

Although it was provided by Congress in the appropriation bill for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1894, that \$10,000 should be devoted, at the discretion of the Postmaster-General, to testing the feasibility of establishing a system of free delivery in rural districts, it has been found impossible, by reason of the pressure of more important questions, for the officers having that subject in charge to give the subject the study and consideration that it demands, much less to establish such rural free delivery. It was soon discovered, furthermore, that the appropriation for this experiment is not at all sufficient for thorough and reliable tests; for, in order to give the rural free-delivery system a fair and thorough trial tests would have to be made in many localities, differing necessarily, in density of population, topography, class of interests, and conditions of highways and thoroughfares. To inaugurate a system of rural free delivery it would require an appropriation of at least \$20,000,000.

The matter came up for discussion in the Senate very soon after this report was made, and in the debate in that Chamber the senior Senator from South Carolina gave it as his opinion that to inaugurate and carry into effect this system would cost not less than \$200,000,000 every year.

The next official allusion to this matter to which I wish to call the attention of the House appears in the message of President Cleveland to Congress, under date of December 4, 1893. Referring to the matter of free rural delivery he says:

I am decidedly of the opinion that the provisions of the present law permit as general an introduction of this feature of mail service as is necessary or desirable, and that it ought not to be extended to smaller communities than are now designated.

Referring, of course, to the fact of the general law, which grants free delivery to cities of 10,000 inhabitants or to offices doing a business of \$10,000 a year, and declaring that in his judgment free delivery ought not to be extended to smaller communities.

I next call the attention of the committee to a single sentence from the annual message of the following year, by President Cleveland, in which he says:

The estimated cost of rural free delivery generally is so very large that it ought not to be considered in the present condition of affairs.

Thus dismissing it with a wave of the hand as an utterly impracticable scheme by reason of the vast expense that would be involved.

It appears, therefore, Mr. Chairman, that a Democratic Postmaster-General, the Democratic chairman of the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads, and a Democratic President all united in agreeing that the establishment of free rural delivery was an impracticable proposition.

Notwithstanding this unfriendly official attitude, however, the demand among the people for this great convenience was so insistent

and the pressure continued so strong that in the last year of the Cleveland Administration the Postmaster-General felt constrained to yield to it, and the Democratic House felt constrained to yield to it. Consequently the \$10,000 which had been appropriated for each of three successive years preceding, but none of which had been used, was gathered up and \$10,000 more added, so that an appropriation of \$40,000 was made for beginning experiments in this line.

Pursuant to the provisions of this appropriation the Postmaster-General instituted forty-four routes. But after what fashion were they instituted? The answer to that question is found in the report of the First Assistant Postmaster-General of the year succeeding, the year which witnessed the inauguration of William McKinley as President. That report reads as follows:

All the details in regard to the installation of the service were placed in the hands of officers of the division of post-office inspection and mail depredations. In order to perform this unwelcome and unappreciated service the inspectors were detached from other pressing duties, upon the successful performance of which, under the regulations of their division, their advancement in rank and pay to some extent depended. It is but just to say that they did the best they could under the circumstances, but they were hampered by orders which left them no discretion. They were instructed to start experimental tests of rural delivery in specifically named localities, no matter whether the conditions seemed to them favorable or otherwise. Some of them became depressed with the idea that the locations assigned to them had been chosen to show that rural free delivery was not desired and was impossible of execution. Of the forty-four selected routes in which the experimental test was made, some of them were deliberately laid out through territory where the people did not want the service and where the physical conditions were such that it cost over 6 cents for every piece of mail delivered.

This extract from the official report certainly makes it absolutely clear that in reluctantly yielding to the demand of the country for the establishment of this service a Democratic Administration had deliberately located the routes at places where the service could not possibly prove satisfactory or of such a nature as to warrant the continuance of the experiment. It is perfectly clear that the experiments were made in such a manner as would bear out the expectation that failure could be reported as the result.

That is the condition that confronted the country, therefore, at the close of Cleveland's Administration. Forty-four experiments were being tried. We all know what has happened since that time. We all know that under the leadership of an Administration friendly, sagacious, and wise this service has been extended until, instead of forty-four feeble and foredoomed-to-failure experiments, there are now over 20,000 free rural routes in actual operation, serving a population, probably, of not less than 10,000,000 people, and the cost has not exceeded in any one year \$12,000,000.

It seems to me, therefore, that the records which I have produced abundantly answer the question which was asked a few moments ago from the other side, as to when and by whom free rural delivery was established in this country. We note by these records that the system was suggested and inaugurated by John Wanamaker under the Harrison Administration; that it was practically abandoned by his Democratic successor, who declared that it would cost \$20,000,000 to inaugurate it, and whose political associate in the Senate declared that to carry it into actual effect would cost \$200,000,000 a year.

We find them trying experiments in such a way as to lead to the conclusion that failure must have been desired and intended. We find the Republican Administration taking hold of this system in this stage of its utmost feebleness and developing it until now it has become one of the most deservedly popular features of our postal system.

I venture to say that with the sole exception of the advance in the price of their products which the past few years has witnessed, no boon has ever come to the farmers of America which is at all to be compared with that of the establishment of the free delivery of their mail; and they owe it absolutely and altogether to the business sense, the sagacity, and the wisdom of the Republican party as carried into effect by a Republican Administration. [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. BOUTELL having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House of Representatives, by Mr. BARNES, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House of Representatives that the President had approved and signed bill and joint resolutions of the following titles:

On December 17, 1903:

An act (H. R. 1921) to carry into effect a convention between the United States and the Republic of Cuba, signed on the 11th day of December, in the year 1902;

Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 66) in relation to commuted rations for midshipmen; and

Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 70) to pay the officers and employees of the Senate and House of Representatives their respective salaries for the month of December, 1903, on the 18th day of said month.

PENSION APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. I now yield thirty minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MIERS].

Mr. MIERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, this bill having been under consideration for six days, I thought it might be proper for me to address a few remarks to the bill and the beneficiaries thereunder. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ADAMS] in referring to this bill spoke of it as "the annual appropriation for the stipend which our Government gives," etc. I do not like the word "gives" in this connection. I would rather regard it as a payment on the obligation of the Government, for which it received an adequate consideration on a debt due, not a gift. Nor do I think this obligation can be met with a mere stipend. [Applause.]

This Government has paid to soldiers, their widows, children, and dependent relatives for all the wars in which the United States has been engaged \$3,038,623,590.16.

Revolutionary war, estimated	\$70,000,000.00
War of 1812	45,186,197.22
Indian wars	6,234,414.55
War with Mexico	33,483,309.91
War of the rebellion	2,878,240,400.17
War with Spain	5,479,268.31
Total	3,038,623,590.16

This in a very small way represents the Government's obligation and debt of gratitude to the men who sacrificed, endured, and fought all the battles of all of the wars in which the United States has been engaged.

This bill appropriates \$138,150,100, being \$7,095,130 less than the appropriation of 1902.

The pension roll of June 30, 1903, bears 996,545 names. The Commissioner's report shows that during the year ending June 30, 1903, there were dropped from the pension roll by reason of death 40,907 names.

I said this in some measure represents the obligation of the Government to the men who fought its battles. I say "obligation" advisedly.

There has been much talk about our duty to the Cubans, our national honor, the theories of free trade, high protection—in fact, nearly everything has been talked about except the merits of this appropriation. The greatness of the country has been ascribed to nearly everything and to nearly everybody except the men who are the beneficiaries of this bill. I beg leave to suggest that but for the men who fought the battles of the Revolution we would have had no republic; that up to 1861 the right of secession was unsettled. It was a question up to that time whether the Government was a mere compact or a union of States. But for the men who fought the battles of 1861 to 1865 these questions would have been settled against us. We would not have been the strong Union of States that we are to-day and would have been unable to extend a helping hand to suffering Cuba. We would not now be the great, patriotic, liberty-loving, prosperous nation that we are.

The discussion under this bill has furnished a theme to place this glory to the credit of a high protective tariff, to free trade, or whatever happens to be the hobby of the Member. The men who fought the battles and made all these glories possible seem to have been almost forgotten.

This is not the first time these men have been forgotten. In 1864, when General Grant was organizing and assembling a great army at Culpeper Court House, General Sherman at Chattanooga, and Sigel down the Shenandoah Valley, and other organizations of soldiers great and small, the wage of battle was uncertain, the very life of the Republic was being despaired of, these men had to be fed and clothed. The national debt had already grown to nearly \$2,000,000,000. The same greed for gain was abroad then as now. The men who controlled the great money markets would loan no more money. The greenbacks went down to 61.4 cents in March, 57.9 in April, 56.7 in May. The soldiers were enduring and fighting for the Union as no other soldiers had done or have since. The money power, that demands so much now, refused to strengthen the credit of the Government and the value of greenbacks depreciated to 47.5. The man who had \$100 in gold wanted \$210.70 for it.

This was not the end. General Grant had lost nearly 70,000 men in the Wilderness; no one could predict what the end would be. General Lee with a force almost at the limits of the Capitol, and this same money power that had \$100 was demanding \$285 for it, and actually refused to loan the Government any more money. The Treasury turned to the people and the men who were fighting its battles in the field, and secured a loan of \$20,000,-

000. If anyone doubts this statement let him turn to the report of the Secretary of the Treasury to Congress in 1864. The interest paid on the seven-thirties was \$141,536,427.73.

June 30, 1864, Congress authorized the Secretary of the Treasury to make another effort to negotiate a loan on bonds redeemable in five years and payable in twenty years, with an interest of 6 per cent in coin. Four hundred million dollars were authorized, but only \$125,561,300 were taken. Greenbacks were worth less than 50 cents on the dollar. The \$125,561,300 were bought for \$62,780,650, thus drawing the equivalent of 12 per cent in coin on the amount invested. In five years' time these bonds were redeemed for \$125,561,300, making to the bondholder 12 per cent annually on his investment for five years, then redeemed at 200 per cent of the original loan.

Fathers, sons, husbands, and brothers were being shot to death in battle for the Union; many were dying of wounds and disease. This same money power was depreciating the value of greenbacks in order that gold might flow back to them from the Treasury. Which class is entitled to the greatest credit; which did the most for the Union? The courage and patriotism of the soldiers, who hesitated at no sacrifice, at no cost of life or health, to save the Union.

Things began to look better in 1865, and Congress authorized a loan at 6 per cent, payable in coin, with greenbacks below half face value; \$203,327,250 were placed, when the gold value was not over \$100,000,000, thereby putting the difference in the pockets of the bondholders, besides the interest at 6 per cent in coin, amounting to over 12 per cent in greenbacks, thus giving the bondholder over two dollars for one. As shown by a very able article in the National Tribune, the man who lent \$221 got back his \$221, \$110 in the advance on his bonds, and \$168 in interest, making a return of \$500 for his loan of \$221; but for the beneficiaries of this bill it would all have been lost.

Who begrudges to these men, who endured such hardships, made such terrible sacrifices, and saved the Union, this small payment on the Government's obligation? These men were paid in the depreciated greenback dollar. The bondholder was paid his interest in coin, and finally his bond was paid in gold. The soldiers' courage never failed; they never winced under hardship nor finched in battle. They made all things possible to this Republic. Now that we have grown strong, let us not forget the obligation that once laid so close to everyone's heart nor the debt of gratitude that we owe. [Applause.]

This great Government gladly and willingly grants a liberal pension, which in a small degree compensates for the maimed limb, wounded and diseased body. Let us not forget these men who sacrificed and endured so much to preserve the Union our forefathers established.

If it was right, which I never believed, to meet all the bondholders' obligations in gold, what is the just desert of these men—the nation's protectors? They were paid in a depreciated dollar. Now that we are at peace and prosperous, with an overflowing Treasury, it would be but right to treat these men as fairly as we did the bondholder, and meet his obligation by payment in kind. This should be done by paying these men now what they should have received forty years ago, the difference between the depreciated currency and gold.

In heralding the glories of the Republic and in referring to our duties of honor, let us not forget the most deserving of all. Let us always be mindful how prone human nature is, how natural it is for the strong to bear down on the weak. How natural it is for a great army to seek for some controversy that it may show its skill in battle. In this day of progress and commercialism let us emulate the example of the founders, and remember that our proud Republic had its inception in throwing off the tyranny of a strong power. The bed rock of our Republic was laid in liberty's cause. That the sweetest word and fondest dream of the forefathers was "liberty." That their rule of action was "the golden rule." [Loud applause.]

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. I now yield twenty minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS].

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, I will not violate in the least the general rule that has been observed in this discussion by saying anything about what is in the pending bill. There has been a great deal said about the so-called Republic of Panama, and I have failed to see any division of sentiment upon the other side, but there seems to be some division on this side. I think we will all acknowledge the fact that the building of an isthmian canal is the milk in the cocoanut.

I think if it had not been for the question of the canal we might never have heard in our time of the Republic of Panama. It seems that the so-called secession in Panama was brought about primarily and for no other purpose than to secure the building of a canal where the present partially built canal is located. Therefore I think the practical question before the country is the

question of whether or not the treaty that has already been negotiated with the so-called Republic of Panama shall be ratified or not.

In treating this question I do not think that it ought to be treated from a political standpoint or a standpoint of party advantage or disadvantage, from the fact that the question of whether we should have an isthmian canal has never been treated as a political question. Both the great parties in their conventions have declared for it repeatedly, and when the matter was before this House the vote was not whether we should have a canal or not.

The only question was whether it should be built at Nicaragua or Panama. We had before us the opinions of the same engineers of the United States Government. We had expert evidence as to both routes; that both were feasible, that both were practicable.

Panama was regarded as the more favorable route, provided that what had already been done there could be purchased for a price stipulated. I believed from the evidence presented that Panama was the more desirable route. To my mind from the evidence it was only a question of routes, as both were declared feasible; and while the House voted by an overwhelming majority in favor of constructing the canal at Nicaragua, when the bill came back from the Senate so amended that it might be built at either place, preferring Panama, and authorizing the President and giving him the same authority to build at either place, we voted for the amended Senate bill.

We negotiated a treaty to build it at Panama, in accordance with the recommendations of the engineers. The statute provides conditions under which the President, not may, but must construct it at Nicaragua. Now, the practical question is, Shall we have it at Nicaragua or Panama? I, for one, do not believe that if the treaty is not ratified the President of the United States will refuse to obey the plain statute and refuse to construct it at Nicaragua.

I believe the President will obey a plain statute of Congress, and the only question to be considered now is as to whether we shall have it at Panama or Nicaragua, for we are going to get it at one or the other place. Some of our friends on this side use the most vigorous language in denunciation of the Panama Republic, characterizing it as only a subterfuge of our own devising; that it was brought about by the agency of the United States, and was really and in fact not an uprising of the people of Panama on their own motion, but instigated and brought about by ourselves for the purpose of obtaining more advantageous terms for the building of the Panama Canal than we could get from the Republic of Colombia.

Then I say to those gentlemen that take that view of it—and I am not saying that they are not correct—how can you turn around and say you are in favor of ratifying the treaty that was made in pursuance of such design? The people are not all fools; they can see through this matter as well as we can. A mere play is worth nothing. If we want to rebuke the action of the Administration in setting up this Republic, as it is claimed it has done, the only practical way to do it is to let the Democratic members of the Senate vote to a man against ratification of the treaty, and then you will have the canal at Nicaragua, and you will not have to endorse the wrong, if there be one, for building the canal at Panama. I think the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. DINSMORE] was entirely logical. After he had denounced the Administration in the terms he had, how could he justify a ratification of the treaty brought about by a republic created as he said this was? He said he could not, and therefore he would oppose the ratification of the treaty.

But I do not think we will gain any ground to stand here and denounce the action of the Administration in setting up this Republic and at the same time say we are going to ratify the treaty made with it and for which it was brought into existence. It does not strike me as a common-sense course. It does not strike me as logical but that they who denounce the Republic should denounce the treaty.

Mr. Chairman, we know it is the law of all the world that they who receive stolen property, knowing it to be stolen, are liable morally and legally. It is not the fact that the canal is not just as good built under this treaty, but what authority have the people to make that treaty? None, except the authority resulting from this movement.

If it is a movement indefensible, covered with turpitude and crime, then to treat with that so-called Government is equivalent to accepting stolen property knowing it to be stolen. The thief may have a stolen horse that will cultivate my crop and draw my cart just as well as though he was the legal owner of it, and the fact that I can make the same use of it does not justify me in buying it, knowing the lack of title. Should I buy it and pay every dollar it is worth to the thief, I become a party to the original crime, punishable by statute, and certainly by every code of morals.

Now, if this matter is as bad as stated by some of those opposed to it, how can they vote to accept the fruits of the crime? For one I can not do it. If this movement was instituted by the connivance or suggestion of the Administration, if it is as black and dark and damnable as it has been painted, I say, for the sake of our own character, we should never ratify the treaty. Never! But if we are going to ratify the treaty and benefit by the fruits of the wrong, the less we say about the crime the better.

I want to say further that we can not dodge the responsibility. If this thing is to be made a party question, the treaty with Panama can not be ratified without Democratic votes in the Senate. What is ratification but approval? It approves not only the document presented on its face, but all of the moral considerations and responsibilities preceding it. I say if it is going to be ratified by Democratic votes in the Senate, there is no use in talking about the enormity of the crime that brought about the Republic. It is idle and useless. Therefore it seems to me that denunciation is indiscreet, unless we are going to take a stand against the ratification of the treaty. That is the reason I asked the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. DINSMORE] in all candor whether he was in favor of ratifying the treaty, and he boldly said "no."

Mr. Chairman, the treaty of Paris was brought before the Senate which provided for the taking over of the Philippine Islands and paying \$20,000,000 for them. A majority of the Democrats were opposed to that part of the treaty, but thirteen Democrats voted for it and made it possible, for it could not have been ratified by the Senate without these Democratic votes. How often have you heard from the other side of the House, when criticism concerning our action in the Philippines was being indulged in, the remark, "You made it possible." Without the help of the Democratic Senators we should have had no Philippines. In that case we had only to guess what the Administration would do, and it was not much of a guess, because they voted down the Bacon resolution, and every amendment offered by us, looking to the establishment of a policy.

Yet many Democrats, condemned what followed in the Philippines, that a plowboy ought to have seen beforehand would follow. Now, if we are going to condemn this Panama Republic, let us do it in the only practical way, and that is, vote against the ratification of the treaty. If we are going to accept the fruits of it, if we are going to accept the benefits of the wrong, and so announce it in advance, for self-respect and for our standing in the world let us say nothing more about it. [Applause.]

I again say I regret that I am unable to agree with some of my colleagues on this side who have characterized this so-called Republic as an abortion on the face of the earth, misbegotten, hag-born, and ditch-delivered, but who are, for the sake of commercial advantages to accrue to us, willing to ratify the treaty with Panama and regard its rejection by the Democrats as a mistake which the Republicans would like for us to make.

I hope the ideals of this side have not sunken to the commercial level; that the action of the Democratic party with regard to the ratification of the treaty with this "hag-born" Republic will not be governed by a dollars-and-cents consideration. We had better be right than rich. National character is more to be desired than national wealth; a splendid history rather than a splendid country.

The very moment the treaty is rejected by the Senate, under the plain, unambiguous terms of the act of Congress, the President must—not may—begin negotiations for the construction of the canal at Nicaragua. How amazing it is that any Member of this House preferring the Nicaragua route should advocate the ratification of this treaty!

Mr. Chairman, as before stated, I believed from the evidence before us at the time that the Panama route was the best, and on equal terms should be selected over Nicaragua, and so voted; but if we have to condone, approve, or even wink at what is alleged to have been the conduct of the Administration in this matter, I for one say perish the thought of ever digging a canal that will in all future times, if not in our own, be regarded as the grave of American honor rather than a monument of American achievement. We had better never have the canal than secure it at the sacrifice of all that is most to be cherished in American history and tradition.

Away with all sordid considerations of gain and greed, and let us look at this matter from the standpoint of national morality. Simply to secure hoped-for commercial advantages is this treaty to be ratified by Democratic votes, thereby accepting the fruits of the work of the Administration, with a full knowledge of what it is and has been; with the responsibility that it will involve us in a war with a neighboring Republic, in which the sympathy of the whole Christian world will be with them; in which much American blood must flow and millions of American treasure be expended? For myself alone, I say most emphatically, No.

I believe the President will not hesitate to discharge his duty,

and will, upon the rejection of the treaty with Panama, at once enter into negotiations to construct the canal at Nicaragua. But if in this I am mistaken, and he should fail to do his plain duty, instead of digging a canal he will most effectually dig his own political grave. With such a refusal on his part, as the nominee of the Republican party he would not carry half a dozen States in the next election. Should this be the case, the Democrats will have saved the national honor, secured the canal where they want it, and sweep the Republican party from power. For all of which let us pray.

Mr. VAN VOORHIS. I understood that some gentleman on the other side desires to speak thirty minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. I do not think there is anyone on this side who desires to speak now.

Mr. VAN VOORHIS. Then I yield thirty minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CALDERHEAD].

Mr. CALDERHEAD. Mr. Chairman, the late hour to-day will not permit me to make any very extended remarks. I intended to pay some attention to the report of the Commissioner of Pensions and to ask the attention of Members to that report and to the amount of work that has been done by the Pension Bureau during the last year.

The administration of that Bureau is showing a very gratifying progress. There is much difficulty in the administration of it. The pension system of the United States has never been a well-planned or well-organized or well-considered system. It has grown up gradually from time to time; and legislation upon that subject has been largely piecemeal. The general pension law which was passed during the time of the civil war was intended to meet the requirements of the pension system at the time and was added to the pension laws which were then in existence.

Those laws had had a long and singular history. There was a time when the administration of the pension laws was under the Secretary of War, and another time when the administration of the pension laws was under the Secretary of the Treasury. There was a time when some legislation proposed that the circuit courts of the United States should hear the claimants and decide who were entitled to pensions and determine the amount and certify their names to the Secretary of War.

The circuit courts, to whom such application was made at the time, declined to hear the applications or to adjudicate such claims for the reason that their judgment upon the matter could not be final in any event, but must always be subject to any subsequent legislative action of Congress. So the courts refused to entertain jurisdiction of such cases when their judgment might be vacated or modified or set aside by the action of Congress afterwards.

Since the general pension law of 1862 a great many amendments have been added to it. As each successive act was passed, new rules for the administration of the law were necessary, and in each case the Bureau was to a large extent bound by the precedents that had been set under the former legislation.

They were necessarily bound by these precedents, for if they attempted to enlarge them or make new rules, then those who had been pensioned under the former law felt that an injustice had been done them and immediately made application for a relief which the law did not provide for in their cases.

Time passed, and as the years passed it became more and more difficult for the soldiers who had survived to prove the origin of their disabilities in the service. A vast number of men who had served faithfully in the Army, and who had become disabled either from injuries received in that service or from disease and injuries received after that time, felt themselves justly entitled to the relief of the pension laws, and yet no provision was made for them in case they would be unable to prove the origin of their disabilities in the service.

The act of 1890 was passed for the purpose of providing pensions for all of that class.

The men who served in the ranks of the Union Army were not hasty in calling upon the Government for relief by pensions. Ten years after the war closed only 6 per cent of the men who served in the ranks of the Union Army had made application for pension at all, even including all those who had actually received wounds or suffered injuries or contracted disease or other disabilities which were incidents of the camp.

Most of the comrades felt when the war closed and for years afterwards that the nation was overwhelmed with the burden of a national debt and that the first duty of the country was to redeem its honor by the payment of it, and that after the national debt had been paid or put in such a condition that it could be paid without being a burden to the country it would be time enough to appeal to the country for attention to their wants.

There was a degree of patriotism in this that has been seldom witnessed in the whole history of our country. Citizenship in a republic is usually ready and free to ask the aid of the government in any emergency, and in every possible direction in which

it can be distributed to the individual. The soldiers of the Union Army were not hasty to seek that kind of aid. Most of them felt, and a large per cent of them still feel, that the pension ought to come graciously from the hand of the country as a mark of honor.

No compensation in dollars and cents can pay for the suffering of wounds, or of disease, or for the loss of health—for long years of pain. The pension should be given graciously by the nation itself as a mark of honor for services voluntarily given to the nation.

It is estimated, I think, by the Commissioner of Pensions and by General Ainsworth, the efficient chief of the record and pension division of the War Department, that 25 per cent of the soldiers of the Union Army now living have never applied for pensions at all. All that vast number of men have still felt themselves able to provide for their own necessities, or have felt that the pension itself should come as the gift of the nation and not as a demand at their hands.

It is estimated, I think, that there are 200,000 soldiers now living who have never asked for a pension at all. I intended to have had along with me to-day the report of the Commissioner of Pensions showing the small number of pensioners, comparatively, who are drawing pensions for injuries received in the service. I think that there are about 264,000. These figures I shall correct in the RECORD. I am giving them now only from memory and approximately.

There are about 430,000 soldiers drawing pensions under the act of June 27, 1890, for disabilities incurred since the service, or for disabilities incurred in the service which they are not able to prove directly under the general law. Of the 430,000 soldiers who are drawing pensions under the act of June 27, 1890, more than one-half of them are drawing only six or eight dollars a month. The amount is comparatively small for each one. I know that it makes a vast aggregate in millions when the total of the pension roll is added up.

I know that one hundred and thirty-six or one hundred and thirty-eight millions paid out annually for pensions to individual pensioners seems like a vast sum; and yet nobody complains when the Postal Department of this Government costs one hundred and fifty-six millions; nobody inquires how much the work of the War Department costs; nobody hesitates about the expense of the Naval Department.

There are few expenses of the Government that are ever questioned or inquired into or complained of, and there is no reason why anyone should say for a moment that a pension roll of one hundred and thirty-six or one hundred and thirty-eight millions is a burden upon the country. Outside of the demagogue who is playing before an audience, and outside of some discussions that we sometimes hear in this Hall, I have never heard any man or woman in all the land utter a complaint that the amount distributed by the general pension roll was too great, or that it was a burden upon the country.

The pension law of 1890 grants a pension of \$12 a month for a total disability to earn a support by manual labor. Under the general law which grants pensions for disabilities incurred in the service, \$30 a month is allowed for total disability to perform manual labor. Now, the soldier who is drawing only \$12 a month under the act of 1890 must be as completely disabled for labor as the soldier who is drawing \$30 a month under the general law, and in the neighborhood where the comrades live, when the comrades look at each other and see one man totally disabled for any kind of labor, helpless with paralysis or totally blind, dependent upon his pension for subsistence, drawing only \$12, while beside him is another neighbor disabled for labor only, walking about ordinarily at his own will, drawing \$30 a month, they feel that there is an inequality in it; and it has been a difficult matter to explain to them and to the country why there should be such a difference. The soldiers themselves soon learn it.

There is another distinction which arises out of the administration of the law that seems to be still more inequitable. The soldier is allowed \$12 a month for a total disability to earn support by manual labor, and the Department is allowed to proportion that rate for less disabilities, so that some receive \$10, and some \$8, and some \$6, but the man who receives \$6 per month receives it upon a rating of one-half total disability for labor. The man who receives \$8 a month receives it upon a rating for a little more than one-half of total disability for labor.

The place where it is felt to be inequitable is this, that no man who is one-half disabled for manual labor will be employed by anybody for manual labor. He gets the labor only as an object of charity. A man who is two-thirds or three-fourths disabled for labor and who gets a pension of \$8 or \$10 a month is not employed by anybody for labor, except when he is employed either as a charity or when he obtains the employment through hard necessity.

He is as utterly prevented from supporting himself by manual labor in many cases, and in most cases, indeed, as the man who is

actually shown to be disabled and drawing his \$12 a month. Now, looking at that condition of things, the soldiers of the Union Army, the men who rendered the service themselves, think that it might be remedied by a general law, and their reason for it is based upon illustrations of this kind.

I think, if I remember the regiment correctly, the Fifth New York Heavy Artillery was a regiment of 1,400 men when it went into the battle of the Wilderness on the morning of the 5th of May. It went through that campaign. It stacked arms in front of Petersburg on the 16th of October with 36 muskets! The 36 men who went through the whole of that terrible campaign without a wound, or without an hour's loss of duty, who saw it all and who remained until the expiration of the war upon duty, and came home without a record of any injury incurred in the service, are precisely the 36 men who can not now prove any disability incurred in the service.

Yet they saw it all. They endured it all. Broken now by years and in many cases by injuries which were received then, but which they can not prove now because the witnesses are all dead, these men and such men as these must seek their relief under the law of 1890, and when one of them shows himself to be totally disabled, instead of getting \$30, as his old comrade does who proves his disability in the service, he gets but \$12; and when he proves himself to be one-half disabled for any kind of labor, instead of getting \$17 or \$24 a month under the general law, he gets but \$6.

His feeling is that all this might be made more equitable by a general law, and for that reason in due time I intend to ask this House to consider a general law, a service pension, granting \$12 a month to all the soldiers of every rank on account of their service without regard to any disability. It is time for it now. It is nearly forty years since the last gun was fired.

I know that legislation of this kind will relieve the Bureau of a vast amount of work which it is now called upon to do. I know, too, that in many cases it will relieve Congress and the Committee on Invalid Pensions of a great burden which is now imposed upon them.

I want to call attention to one thing more. The Committee on Invalid Pensions is not organized as a court of appeals from the Pension Bureau. It is organized for the consideration of cases that can not be decided by the Pension Bureau; organized for the purpose of granting relief in cases where the Bureau can not grant it under any existing law.

There are some cases in which the Bureau can not grant pensions, for the reason that the evidence does not satisfy them and is not sufficient to comply with the letter of the law. Sometimes serious complaint is made about the Bureau, that it requires a literal compliance with the letter of the law. Now, it is true that some discretion is given to the Commissioner of Pensions in construing the evidence, and whenever he shall be satisfied that the evidence is sufficient to authorize a pension he may grant it. The law gives him that latitude.

But you can easily see that he can not distribute that discretion through the 134 men who are merely his clerks and who must necessarily hear and consider and pass upon this testimony. He can not personally examine the thousands of cases. If he distributed his discretion to the board of review or even to the board of appeals in his Bureau, then no limit could be placed upon the administration of the law. One clerk might exercise his discretion liberally in one case, and another less liberally in another case exactly like it, and the discrepancy between these two would destroy the effect of the law and would involve the Bureau in perpetual contention with the claimants. There are many cases that can not be allowed by the Bureau.

The work of the Committee on Invalid Pensions, with which I have become familiar during the last two terms of Congress, has been made unwittingly burdensome by the Members of Congress themselves. I do not speak now for the purpose of criticising any man or any Member of the House, and yet, although we have only been in session since the 7th of this month in this session, there are now in that committee room over 4,000 bills for private pensions.

Every Member of this House knows when he introduces his bills that he can not possibly obtain more than seven or eight, by the most liberal favor of the committee. There is not time either to consider them in the committee or to pass upon them in the House. But when a Member introduces 100 or 200 private pension bills, mailing to each claimant a copy of his bill and advising him that his case is pending before the Invalid Pensions Committee, the claimant immediately writes to the committee and the committee is burdened with an answer to him, telling him why his case can not be taken up and considered at that time.

The claimant believes that the committee is doing him an injustice, or else he feels that the committee is showing favoritism to some one else. This is a matter of injustice which you are working toward the members of the committee.

It would be an easy matter for the Members of the House to select five, or six, or seven, or eight cases from their districts—cases of the greatest distress, cases that are clearly entitled by the evidence in their possession to this special relief—and to present them to the committee. We could accomplish our work and present it to the House much sooner.

Just one thing more concerning the work of that committee. Although we were called in session upon the 9th of November, the committee was not named until the 5th of December, and during all that time the Members of the House were introducing their private bills and sending them to the committee as if it were organized and ready for work. During that time there was no organization of the committee, there were no clerks, there was no procedure by which we could make a record of the bills.

Now, since the 5th of December, when the committee was appointed, we have the regular clerk of the committee and we have a man detailed from the Pension Bureau for the purpose of examining these cases and making an abstract of them to give to us. These two men labor together to make an index of the bills, to put them upon a docket, and make an index of them, so that they can be found when we want them for consideration. During all of the last term of Congress, with the same two men, and with a stenographer and two additional clerks, that force was compelled to work from the time they came to the Capitol in the morning, at 8 or 9 o'clock, until 10 or 11 o'clock at night, just simply to keep records of that kind for the committee in order that we might have the bills ready for consideration when we met.

This is not fair to the committee. The House has not yet allowed that committee any additional clerks. The House will take its holiday recess on Saturday. There will be no provision for additional clerks before that time. We will not assemble again until the 4th of January. We can not have any additional clerks until you grant them after a report from the Committee on Accounts, when that time comes, and then we can begin the consideration of your private bills.

You can see for yourselves, if you think about it, that it will be the last Friday in January before that committee can make a report upon any bill in the House. You are delaying the matter in which you yourselves are interested by the manner in which you are burdening the committee with bills that you do not intend to ask to have passed, and yet which must be recorded, docketed, and indexed for action of the committee. This is a matter that you can care for yourselves.

There are some other matters concerning the pension laws about which I desire to speak, but I will take the time some other day. The older nations have learned by experience, and when a soldier is discharged from the army of France, or from the army of Spain, or from the army of Germany a medical record is made showing his physical condition, showing what injuries he received in the service.

If he is married, a record is made of the residence of his wife and children and their number. From that time on while he lives a record is maintained of his family and of his wife and children while they live. When he dies, by operation of law the widow and children become entitled to pension.

It is a matter which is ascertained by the Government, not by the widow and children. In our country they must become claimants. They must make proof, and to make proof in accordance with the exact letter of the law is in many cases impossible now. It is forty years since the war closed. In some cases it is fifty or sixty years since the soldier married the widow which he has left.

Now it is impossible for her to prove by record or by living witnesses the fact of her marriage, the fact that she was never married before, and that she had never been divorced, and that he had never been married to another, and facts like these. Yet until these facts are shown, she does not show herself to be the only claimant in the case entitled to the pension.

It is true that the Department may waive some matters of the proof in cases where the evidence may seem satisfactory with her own statement in reference to these facts and assume them to be true. Yet the Department can not permit, as I said, the clerks who are doing the work to exercise that discretion, for if they did one might violate a sound discretion, and by liberality in one case and by strict requirement in another case there would not be an equal administration of the law.

I think there might be some amendment in the general law which would enable the Department to ascertain now, while the soldier is living, who his wife is, and who his children are that will become entitled to pension at his death. This matter might be remedied, and until it is remedied by law there can be no relief through the Bureau or from it.

I spoke a little while ago of the general relief that might be given to the work of the Bureau by the passage of a general service-pension law at the rate of \$12 per month. It is time for it. I know by my acquaintance with the men in the ranks that the

average age of the survivors must be nearly 65 years now. I am only speaking from my general knowledge of the men who were in the ranks when I was.

It is time for this service pension. Long before the men reached that age a service pension was granted to the survivors of the Revolutionary war thirty-five years after it closed. A service pension was not granted to the survivors of the war of 1812 till a late date, but a service pension was granted to the survivors of the war with Mexico before they reached the average age of 65.

There is no reason now why the same liberal pension, the same generous recognition by the Government, should not be given to the soldiers of the Union Army, except the fact that it will largely increase this appropriation. But this is a diminishing roll. The years carry them away very rapidly now.

I said before, and I repeat it now, that outside of the discussions we may have here, outside of the orations of some demagogue talking for partisan purposes upon the stump, you never hear a man, woman, or child in all the land complain that the amount appropriated and paid for pensions is too much or that it is burdensome in any way.

Following the policy of our party, we have provided a generous revenue for the support of the Government. We have done it not only with a view of providing a revenue, but for the purpose of protecting the labor and industrial energy of our country; and in its administration the revenues have been large enough to pay this roll which we are now appropriating for and to pay all the other expenses of the Government upon a most generous and most magnificent scale and still leave a surplus going into the Treasury.

Now, this roll is decreasing annually by death. Can it not be made up by some general legislation that will reach the men who have never yet had any relief, that never yet had the recognition which a generous nation owes to men who tendered their lives and their services that the Government might live?

It was not merely a battle to decide a question of constitutional law; it was not merely a battle to ascertain which political party was right in the policy of the nation; it was not merely a battle to determine whether there should be freedom or slavery in the land, it was a battle for the preservation of the Union; a battle for the preservation of the Government; a battle to maintain for the world a Government founded upon liberty and equality before the law.

It was the utter destruction of the Government that was threatened. It was the preservation of that Government and its institutions that was maintained. It was the war of self-defense and of self-preservation, and these men to whom this recognition is given are the men who voluntarily gave their service for that preservation. [Applause.]

They are the men to whom this recognition is due. They ought not to be required to come as claimants. They ought to be sought out by the nation and this distinguished honor carried and delivered to them in testimony of the gratitude of the nation for their services. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I will avail myself of unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. CALDERHEAD. Under this leave the following is appended, taken from the report of the Commissioner of Pensions:

The following table shows the number of pensions and the monthly rate thereof. Total number of pensions June 30, 1903, was 996,545.

Rate.	Number of pensions.
\$6 and under.....	129,614
From \$6 to \$8, inclusive.....	344,620
From \$8 to \$10, inclusive.....	86,696
From \$10 to \$12, inclusive.....	296,084
From \$12 to \$14, inclusive.....	22,923
From \$14 to \$15, inclusive.....	3,732
From \$15 to \$16, inclusive.....	9,034
From \$16 to \$17, inclusive.....	43,784
From \$17 to \$18, inclusive.....	736
From \$18 to \$20, inclusive.....	7,316
From \$20 to \$24, inclusive.....	25,216
From \$24 to \$25, inclusive.....	3,114
From \$25 to \$30, inclusive.....	14,472
From \$30 to \$33, inclusive.....	540
From \$36 to \$45, inclusive.....	3,536
From \$45 to \$50, inclusive.....	3,254
From \$50 to \$72, inclusive.....	3,787
From \$72 to \$100, inclusive.....	77
At \$125.....	1
At \$166.....	3
At \$208.....	1
At \$416.....	2
Total.....	996,545

The average value of a pension is \$133.49. Over one-half of the pensions are \$10 or under.

The whole number now receiving pensions by special acts is as follows:

SOLDIERS AND SAILORS.	
203 at.....	\$12.00
40 at.....	14.00
16 at.....	15.00
43 at.....	16.00
112 at.....	17.00
16 at.....	18.00
143 at.....	20.00
316 at.....	24.00
26 at.....	25.00
378 at.....	30.00
37 at.....	36.00
130 at.....	40.00
44 at.....	45.00
152 at.....	50.00
71 at.....	72.00
1 at.....	75.00
9 at.....	100.00

WIDOWS.	
114 at.....	8.00
4 at.....	10.00
869 at.....	12.00
7 at.....	14.00
54 at.....	15.00
1 at.....	16.00
67 at.....	17.00
51 at.....	18.00
183 at.....	20.00
2 at.....	22.00
22 at.....	24.00
91 at.....	25.00
134 at.....	30.00
1 at.....	32.00
17 at.....	35.00
35 at.....	40.00
1 at.....	42.00
2 at.....	45.00
150 at.....	50.00
7 at.....	75.00
16 at.....	100.00
1 at.....	125.00
3 at.....	166.66
1 at.....	208.33
2 at.....	416.66

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, I propose to discuss briefly the recent much-used expression which has been injected into political literature. It consists of two words, "Stand pat." It could not be expected that a Texan could understand what this means. [Laughter.] Out of deference to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN], who is prone to twit the Texans with being uninformed, I took occasion to look into the origin and history of this expression. It comes from the lips of one of the greatest players in the great American game of politics, Senator HANNA, of Ohio, who might, in the light of recent events, be aptly termed the suppressed possible President of the United States.

Knowing the gift of the Senator as I do for being apt in phrase, as in other things, I was led to inquire more diligently into the meaning of this expression. I found that it belongs to the great American game commonly called "poker," and that it means to play a hand as dealt without drawing for any more cards. I found upon further investigation, however, that it is not invariably true that a player who "stands pat" has a hand that justifies him in betting his money. [Laughter and applause.] But that occasionally it happens, and possibly it will in the coming Presidential campaign, wherein the hand of the Senator from Ohio has been turned over to be played by the strenuous gentleman from New York; that in the show down the player may be bluffing and may have only a "bobtailed flush." [Laughter.]

Now, seriously, gentlemen, this expression stands for something, as might be expected, coming from the source it does. I understand the purpose and design of the junior Senator from Ohio in his use of this expression to be simply this: "The Republican party went into power, it enacted the Dingley law, and the country became prosperous; here is cause and effect, and voters should oppose any change of this party and its policies." This expression is invoked not only against Democratic success, but against the "Iowa idea" as well. It involves the assertion that the prosperity of the country has been produced by the Republican party and its protectionism and the unwisdom of any change of either.

Those who use it in effect say, "We take our present hand; let others draw to better their hands, but we 'stand pat.'" They are "it." The acme of government has been reached. "Stand pat!"

Now, this furnishes food for thought to every patriot, for, unhesitatingly, I proclaim, so far as I am concerned, that if it be true that the Government can produce prosperity, and that Republican Government has produced prosperity for the past six years, every patriot would owe it to himself and his country to oppose any break in this prosperity.

But, I undertake to say, Mr. Chairman, that the contention voiced in this expression "stand pat" involves a false economic doctrine to start with; that it is untrue, in fact, and is a pernicious theory, destructive to the self-reliance of our citizens in its educative suggestion.

I belong, I am proud to say, to that school of political thought which believes that power and prosperity go hand in hand; that both originate with the people and travel upward and bless every class and section that they touch. I deny that prosperity can be produced by any government, or that it ever has been produced by any government at any period of the world's history. Of course I do not speak of prosperity of the individual or of a class, or a mere locality that is bound up in the fortunes of that individual or that class, for these may be favored by government. A household, circumscribed, individual class or local prosperity may be produced by government.

That I admit, though I contend it will be at the expense of all other individuals, classes, and localities than those favored. But that permanent and universal prosperity can be produced in this country by the Government is not sound as an economic theory. Prosperity does not flow down from the powers that be, but springs up from the soil and seasons and the industry and intelligence of our citizens. [Applause.] Prosperity, my countrymen, is a hybrid—half divine, half human—born of the blessing of God in soil and season, and of the industry and intelligence of mankind. Prosperity comes to our country in no other way than this natural way, which augments the national wealth by the products of the soil. God made this country to feed the world, and keyed its potent forces upon its fertile soil and favorable climate. The American farmer, who plants in faith, cultivates in hope, and reaps in grace, is the uncrowned king of the world. Long may he reign, unfettered to pour out his products into the markets of the world, to bless foreign nations, and to enrich his own. [Applause.]

Long ago a great thinker said, "The best governed people is the least governed," and thoughtful consideration for a century since has only confirmed the wisdom of that vital governmental proposition. The reason of it is simply this: That in an ideal republic like ours, where all power emanates from the people, the closer the proper functions of government can be bounded and controlled within the limitations of its design of preventing crime and protecting the weak against the strong, reserving to the people the sources of power, the better for the people and the better for their public servants. The nearer prosperity can be kept in its natural channels, untouched by the legislative hand, the better for the country where it has its birth. Every time you attempt by the hand of law to interfere with the natural channels of prosperity, you only obstruct, restrict, hinder, localize, that which would be wider, more natural, more beneficent, if left to its natural pathway and its ordinary progress.

I take it, it will scarcely be denied by any thoughtful man that prosperity must originate in the homes of the people, where the real source of production is. Let us trace for a moment the natural pathway and progress of prosperity. European agriculture has not prospered, and there is a demand for meat and bread in the markets of Europe; seasons have been favorable in these United States; there is a great wheat crop here; there is a great cotton crop here, and the cattle raiser with his cattle on a thousand hills has been successful and has prospered in the breeding and raising of cattle. What happens then? So much is produced as that not only 80,000,000 inhabitants of the United States are supplied, but an immense surplus is borne down the lines of railway to the sea, and into the holds of the vessels of the world, and by them carried into the markets of the world, under the banner, if you please, of absolute free trade, and in competition in the markets of the world with all these products.

In turn for these products the gold of Europe is poured in a great tide back into American homes. Then what happens? There is an increased capacity to buy on the part of those engaged in the production of these great products, and wherever there exists such an increased capacity on the part of the people to satisfy their needs or their desires more purchases occur. This people, thus blessed by soil and season and their intelligent industry, go about in the stores of the land and buy the various things they need to satisfy their wants or desires—aye, their fancies and whims—and retail trade, closest to and most dependent upon the people, rapidly responds to this birth of prosperity.

The retail dealers begin to buy through drummers, and by letters, of the wholesale houses. Wholesale houses, realizing the impetus to their trade, make larger drafts upon the manufacturer, and the manufacturer gets a move on him; the smoke begins to rush faster and higher out of the factory chimneys, and the railroads get busy, and all along the pathway thus described, from the field to the foreign market, back again, and from the home people to the manufacturer and back again, labor everywhere gets increased employment, and an added capacity to buy, predicated upon the original capacity to buy, occurs. And thus in an endless chain in God's ordained way prosperity rolls on unfettered and blesses the American people regardless of whether the President is named Grover Cleveland or William McKinley. [Applause.]

Mark it, my countrymen, a man teaches a dangerous and pernicious doctrine to the people when he urges them to look to party and government rather than to God and himself for prosperity and success. I have said that this position of "stand pat" not only involves an economic fallacy, but that it is false in fact. What are the facts? What has the Republican party done to produce this prosperity of which they boast to be the divine authors—a claim that has been a lie in the mouth of every imperialist that ever cursed mankind since the dawn of history—that contention which prompts its advocates to say from the thrones of earth, "We pour out our blessings on the people; we take care of our children?" Nero taught that, Caesar taught that, all the infamous oppressors in history advocated that doctrine. It is the dogma of despotism!

What have you done? True, you passed the Dingley tariff bill. Very well; what of it? If there had not been on the part of the American people increased capacity to buy, how would your spindles have turned faster, how would more labor have been called for, how would more goods have been sold, how would your manufacturing industries have been stimulated?

You talk of foreign trade; but you know it is a bagatelle in comparison with the enormous American demand for American goods. This increased capacity to buy has come from what? From the blessings of God in soil and season and the intelligent industry of our citizens, reinforced by an economy taught them by those bitter years which afflicted our country, and especially the South, from 1890 to 1896, when the prices of cotton, cattle, and wheat were so low as scarcely to cover the cost of production.

These conditions rapidly changed. The price of cattle jumped from \$10 to \$20 per head, the price of wheat rose from 48 cents to more than \$1 per bushel, and cotton has advanced from 4 cents to 12 cents per pound. Naturally the people could buy more, and naturally they did buy more, and prosperity came to our country in its natural way. And what we got from God and our own industry the Republican party proceeds to proclaim as its gift to the nation, and cries, "Stand pat!" The fact is that during these years of prosperity the farmer and the stockman, the producers of our country, have been robbed of much of this prosperity by the extortions in price of the trusts, operated under the shelter of protection. And over against this cry of "Stand pat!" the Democratic party cries, "Right about face, and as rapidly as possible, consistent with existing conditions, revise and reduce the tariff, tear the shelter off monopoly, administer economic, honest government, and let prosperity be divided among the people in accordance with heaven-ordained methods." [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

The record of production and exportation of crops and meats for the last ten years shows that the facts are in accord with the true economic theory of prosperity as I have outlined it, and that prosperity came in this land not as a result of McKinley and his policies, but as a result of the energy of the American people and the fertility of their soil, favorable seasons, and an advantageous world market, which, if affected at all, was affected adversely by the Dingley Act. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The recent report of our able Secretary of Agriculture—and it affords me pleasure to digress to say that, in my judgment, he is one of the best the country has ever had—contains abundant, in fact, unanswerable, evidence of the truth of the position I have taken, and his statement is so complete that I insert it at some length, beginning on page 8, as follows:

Out of their continued abundance, during the past year, the farmers of the nation have contributed food and raw materials for manufactures to hundreds of millions of people in foreign countries, besides sustaining 80,000,000 at home.

A survey of half a century discovers the remarkable character of the movement in which the farmers of this country have become the chief purveyors of the world.

In 1851 our shipments of farm products were valued at \$147,000,000, while half a century later, in 1901, they amounted to \$952,000,000, an increase of \$805,000,000, or about 550 per cent. The farmers' export trade for the decade 1851-1860 amounted to \$1,896,000,000, and in the following decade, in spite of the transfer of multitudes of men from productive to destructive life, the total was \$2,431,000,000. In the decade after that the export trade doubled and amounted to \$4,864,000,000. In the next decade the amount grew to \$5,740,000,000, and the total for the decade of 1891-1900 was \$7,082,000,000, or an average of over \$708,000,000 a year. Subsequent to the last-named period this trade has gone on increasing and reached its highest amount in 1901, with exports valued at \$952,000,000. The export trade in farm products for 1903 was valued at over \$878,000,000, an amount second only to that of 1901.

The consumption of cotton in this country is now greater than that of any other country, and yet the cotton planters of the South not only supplied this market last year but exported a surplus of 3,569,000,000 pounds, valued at \$317,000,000, or for every working day in the year about 12,000,000 pounds, worth more than \$1,000,000.

Represented in value, the exports of grain and grain products had about two-thirds the importance of cotton in the last fiscal year, the value of the export being more than \$221,000,000. From 46,000,000 acres of wheat there was a surplus for foreign months amounting to 114,000,000 bushels and 20,000,000 barrels of flour, amounts that together represent 204,000,000 bushels of wheat.

Third in importance are the exports of meats and meat products, with a grand total of \$178,000,000, to which may be added \$35,000,000 for live animals. Quantities that are beyond the grasp of the mind represent the exports of

meats and their products. The pounds of beef were 385,000,000; of pork, 551,000,000; of lard, 491,000,000; and of oleo oil, 126,000,000.

The foregoing figures, it should be borne in mind, do not stand for the total production of the farms, but for the surplus production after the wants of the people at home have been satisfied.

THE FARMER'S BALANCE OF TRADE.

The immense exports from the farms of the country lead to an examination of the so-called balance of trade. This examination reveals what seems to have escaped the attention of the public, and that is, that the favorable balance of trade, everything included, is due to the still more favorable balance of trade in the products of the farm.

During the thirteen years 1890-1902 the average annual excess of domestic exports over imports amounted to \$275,000,000, and during the same time the annual average in favor of farm products was \$337,000,000, from which it is apparent that there was an average annual adverse balance of trade in products other than those of the farm amounting to \$62,000,000, which the farmers offset and had left \$275,000,000 to the credit of themselves and the country.

Taking the business of 1903, the comparison is much more favorable to the farmers than during the preceding thirteen-year period, since the value of domestic exports over imports was \$367,000,000, the entire trade being included, while the excess for farm products was \$422,000,000, which was sufficient not only to offset the unfavorable balance of trade of \$56,000,000 in products other than those of the farm, but to leave, as above stated, the enormous favorable balance of \$367,000,000.

During the last fourteen years there was a balance of trade in favor of farm products, without excepting any year, that amounted to \$4,806,000,000. Against this was an adverse balance of trade in products other than those of the farm of \$865,000,000, and the farmers not only canceled this immense obligation, but had enough left to place \$3,940,000,000 to the credit of the nation when the books of international exchange were balanced.

These figures tersely express the immense national reserve-sustaining power of the farmers of the country under present quantities of production. It is the farmers who have paid the foreign bondholders.

MAGNITUDE OF PRODUCTION.

The height to which farm production has risen to supply the demands of domestic and foreign consumption should not be overlooked. Taking the range of recent years, there is the product of wheat, 600,000,000 to 750,000,000 bushels, worth to the farmer from \$350,000,000 to \$450,000,000. On more than 90,000,000 acres grow 2,000,000,000 to 2,500,000,000 bushels of corn, with a value which ran up to more than \$1,000,000,000 on the farm in 1902.

The oat crop now reaches close to 1,000,000,000 bushels, with a value of \$300,000,000; the barley crop overruns 100,000,000 bushels, worth \$50,000,000, and the rice crop in 1902 amounted to 300,000,000 pounds.

One of the most valuable three of all farm crops is that of hay, aggregating about 50,000,000 to 60,000,000 tons, worth \$450,000,000 to \$550,000,000; ranging between 200,000,000 and 300,000,000 bushels is the potato crop.

The acreage of the cotton crop has displayed a tendency to increase considerably during the last few years, and in 1903 was about 29,000,000 acres; the number of bales produced in recent years ranges from 10,000,000 to 11,000,000, while the value of the entire crop on the plantations has gone as high as \$511,000,000 for the crop of 1900, or, if the seed is included, \$530,000,000.

Tobacco is another crop of expanding proportions, and the prospect now is that within a few years ten figures will be required to represent the annual production. This crop has now climbed close to 900,000,000 pounds, valued at \$60,000,000.

Only some of the principal farm products have been mentioned, but these are sufficient to indicate, in conjunction with information concerning the less important products, that the value of all farm products not fed to live stock for 1903 considerably exceeded their value in the census crop year 1899, when it was \$3,742,000,000.

NATIONAL STOCK OF FARM ANIMALS.

The Department's inventory of farm animals January 1, 1903, discovers that while some classes of animals are only holding their large proportions, others are increasing. The horses number 16,557,000, with a value of \$1,031,000,000. The mules have increased to 2,728,000, with a value of nearly \$200,000,000.

I commend the above statement, coming from a distinguished citizen of the State of Iowa, to the other distinguished citizen of Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN], who seems to place a just value upon information, and in passing I will say to him that Texans may be uninformed, but that we have a better university, a better free school system, and a bigger free school fund than has the State of Iowa. We have a school fund of \$11,000,000 in Texas, invested in State and county bonds, the interest from which, together with interest on payments on public lands and leases on public lands, makes up the annual available permanent school fund, which, by the way, is prorated equally among the blacks and whites, according to scholastic population, and which runs five months' free schools without a cent's taxation upon the property of any citizen.

Mr. Chairman, this stand-pat policy is not only an economic fallacy, not only false in fact, but is pernicious and evil in its educational tendencies, and this, in my judgment, is the greatest indictment, the most serious arraignment of the Republican doctrine of protection. The debates attending the adoption of the Constitution of the United States, under which we now live, and the speeches of the great thinkers, who went home from that convention to advocate its adoption in the States, show that every class of thinker then conceded that the tariff provision in the Constitution of the United States was a mere power to tax the people of the United States to raise revenues to run an honest government. And for years and years and years no man belonging to any school of political thought contended otherwise than that.

The tariff is a tax on consumers. To that doctrine the Democrats have adhered with unswerving devotion. Our objection to protection lies in the fundamental falsity of the doctrine, which leads to false ideas along the whole line of constitutional government, as it must. Let a man embrace in religious thought one fundamentally false tenet, and it leads him on into an endless embrace of false doctrine after false doctrine, in order to have a consistent system, although he accepts them as true. It is exactly so in politics.

The Republican has taken the opposite idea, that the taxing powers of this Government can be perverted from the constitutional purpose originated by the founders of it and used for the purpose of conferring directly a class benefit for the purpose of conferring indirectly an alleged universal benefit. They say that by using the taxing power to restrict commerce, to restrict competition, that you protect the American manufacturer by shutting off his competitors, enabling him to have increased prices, benefiting him directly, and indirectly the whole country; and you have taught the people that taxing powers can be used for the direct and personal benefit of a class of individuals engaged in a given industry. You admit it; you can not deny it.

Protection would not protect if it did not increase the price of the product of the manufacturer upon which the tariff is laid, and the very doctrine of protection assumes a class benefit at the start; and the best contention you have made or ever can make is that indirectly flowing through the pockets of the manufacturer it blesses, first, labor, and then all others in touch with it. It educates the people at the start into a false idea that they can look to government for help; that they can look to government for prosperity in their business; that they can look to government to aid their profits; look to government to strengthen their revenues, to enlarge and swell their gains.

Is it possible that the Government of Washington, of Jefferson, of Franklin, of Adams, in a little over a hundred years has become so debased, corrupt, and commercialized as that publicly can be proclaimed from the hilltop the endless clamoring doctrine of "stand pat;" that it is right—right to use the taxing powers of the Government to benefit classes and individuals and localities? I can not believe that it is right, and I doubt either the judgment or the sincerity of the man who contends for that position.

You have taught for years not only that the taxing power of the Government ought to be used to aid the manufacturer in an increase of price, but you have added to that big cur dog the little tail that labor would be benefited by this philanthropic manufacturer under that system. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I think possibly a few misguided fanatics, a few wild theorists, may have believed in that, but I do not believe that any really profound thinker who ever advocated the doctrine of economic protection ever believed that it inured to the benefit of labor in general.

I say you have talked to all the great labor unions of the country, all the toilers in the factories and everywhere—you have pretended to them that if they help you in maintaining this theory it is for their benefit. Why, some years ago the doctrine of protection was keyed, not upon the commercial advantages to the manufacturer, not upon building up commerce and enabling it to make a struggle for foreign trade supremacy; that is a new modern invention. The original contention was that it would build up the home market and increase the wage of the American workman.

You said that in your platforms, and yet the pathway of your protective theory and your giant trust-organized manufacturing concerns is marked by a death struggle between organized labor and organized capital to wring from the pockets of greed and avarice, protected by your policy, a just wage for its daily sweat. [Applause on the Democratic side.] If labor sometimes be presumptuous, if labor sometimes in its strenuous fight for its rights goes perhaps further than it ought and clamors for more than it ought in justice to receive, the Republican is the last man to complain, for he taught labor to do that. [Applause on the Democratic side.] He taught labor the theory that the taxing powers of this Government were to be used not only to benefit the manufacturer but the laborer.

If these misguided people rise up and make a demand upon you for their rights, you had better yank some of the dollars out of the pockets of the trusts and permit them to flow into the pockets of the laborers of the country, and do the dead square thing. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

What can be more corrupting, more debasing to an American civilization than to teach the false idea of letting the people rush to government for every ill that human flesh is heir to; than to teach the people to look, not to God and themselves, but to government and the Republican party? The lesson, my colleagues, is pernicious. It is evil. It is bearing bitter fruit, and must ever go on bearing it as long as this policy can be maintained and foisted upon the American people.

If the taxing power can be used for class privilege, if government is for the benefit of producing a kind of hothouse prosperity, what reason is there that any class, in any contingency, may not appeal to government? What is the matter with Edward Bellamy and his Looking Backward, if it be true that prosperity is the child of government? Why not resolve the government into two forces—the employer and the employed—knock out all middlemen, and have a kind of universal reign on earth of peace and good

will to men, in which the property is evenly distributed, and government is the parent of all, and protects all its children with all the blessings that it has?

It is only a difference of distance, and not of direction. It is only a difference in extent of application of theory, and not character of doctrine. The basic line must be drawn just here. Just here the Democratic party has ever drawn it, and will draw it sharply in the next campaign. And while the "Iowa idea" may get off in some dark recess and juggle with the "stand-pat" policy, and stifle its voice in practical politics and in the press, yet at the polls, where honest men will vote their sentiments, it will not be stifled. The American people, in my judgment, are rapidly coming to the point of realizing that this theory of protection is basically false economically, that it is false in fact, pernicious in teaching, leading to the centralization of wealth and power, and ultimately will be destructive of the perpetuity and safety of this Republic.

I hear a great deal of talk in these days about the reorganization of the Democratic party. That is laughable; that is silly. Reorganize a party that has 6,000,000 votes and over! I will tell you what these people fear who prate about the reorganization of the Democratic party. They fear the reunion of all the patriots of this country against oppression and tyranny and vice in government. That is what they dread, and that, in my judgment, is what is certain to happen in the next Presidential election.

I am not so much concerned about the Panama question or about pensions for those who fought in the civil war. The war is over. We will survive any mistake about Panama. But I am deeply concerned about the vital economic theories upon which this Government shall be administered for all time. Protection is either right or wrong, either radically wrong or fundamentally right. It is either, as Grover Cleveland's platform proclaimed it to be, "a fraud, a robbery of the many to enrich the few," or it is a blessing to mankind. The issue needs to be sharply joined. Let the American people determine which is best for the country, government administered by the organized trusts, in the interest of the trusts and protection their pet, or to have it utterly dominated by those in favor of a prosperity that flows from the people in their industry and economy and the blessings of God in soil and season.

Once in a while you will hear some small two-by-four fellow talking about the tariff being a "local issue." Oh, yes; it is local for every fellow voting for his locality regardless of what is right for all the others. Yes, that is true, if a man is willing to violate fundamental principles, willing to vote against the Constitution, willing to grab some prosperity from the country "for me and my wife, my son John and his wife," regardless of all that happens to all the rest. To him it is a local issue.

It is a local issue with all the Republicans, in which those who have the longest pull and the strongest pull get together and crowd out the little fellows. That is practical protection under Republican régime. Upon the tariff Democrats stand for protection for nobody, nowhere, and at no time.

Mr. OVERSTREET. That is right. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. BURGESS. The original doctrine of the tariff was a tax levied upon consumption which yielded revenue for the support of the Government—not a bad tax and not an unfair one for this reason.

There were scarcely any factories, and wealth was practically evenly distributed. All that we bought we bought practically abroad, and bought practically in equal quantities, man to man, so that a tax upon consumption was a fair tax then. But time rolled on. Factories began to spring up, and then clamors arose about different things, asking for a tariff for this purpose and then for the other. The Democratic party took its position and has maintained it ever since. Occasionally we hear some man speaking of Grover Cleveland's famous tariff message in 1887 as if he had invented a new thing for the Democratic party.

Why, Mr. Chairman, that identical proposition of "a tariff for revenue only" as advocated by him is in every Democratic platform written prior to the war. It is the ancient continued Democratic doctrine; and the Democracy says now, "Levy a tariff for revenue sufficient to meet the honest needs of the Government; levy it carefully and fairly, with no disposition to break existing hothouse enterprises," but put a stop to the appealing of anybody to protect his interests against the interests and rights of others.

Let protection go. Turn out all these people who come here to lobby and urge that this schedule and that schedule be fixed so as to build up their locality at the expense of the rest of the country. It is wrong. That is the Democratic view. What we stand for is a tariff for revenue so adjusted as to operate fairly

upon all classes and all sections, not for the purpose of giving protection to anybody, but for the purpose of raising enough and no more revenue than is made necessary by the needs of an honest and economical government.

The tariff is a tax, and under existing conditions a bad system of taxation in that inherent in it it has the evil of an incidental class benefit to the manufacturers of those articles upon which the tariff is laid. But this can not be avoided. It is inherent in the system. Do not make the mistake, however, of taking the incidental evil of the system and making it the basis of operating the system. On the other hand, levy the tariff so as to lessen and spread out this evil as widely as the system will admit and to equalize the burdens of taxation paid under the system by the consumers of the country to the greatest possible degree by taxing all articles of import.

Take this simple ground for tariff enactments, namely, divide all imported articles into three classes—necessities, comforts, and luxuries. Levy the lightest rate upon the first, a higher rate upon the second, and a still higher rate upon the third, but the same rate on all articles of the same class and such a rate upon all as that enough will be raised under its operation to meet the needs of an honest, economic government. By this simple Democratic method all selfish contentions between classes and sections will be avoided, and justice will be as perfect as the system of taxation admits. No man can be expected to do more, and no honest one can in conscience do less.

Now, in conclusion, my colleagues, this gaming expression, "stand pat," is a forceful one, and peculiarly appropriate to the Republican idea of politics as a practical game. Gaming, whether in the hovels of the poor or the palaces of the rich, whether in the poker, monte, or faro exchanges, or in the wheat, cotton, and stock exchanges of the country, is undoubtedly wrong. The acquisition of money by gambling can not be morally defended. But there is honor even among thieves, and if politics is to be played as a game, and you are to "stand pat" with your hand, we have the right to run out the analogy and insist upon an honorable game.

Let us play the game out like gentlemen; let us have no purchased votes, no intimidated voters, but let every American instead cast his ballot for the right as God gives him to see it. I will tell you right now I don't care how fast and furious you play the game, how "pat" you stand, we are going to have a showdown in the next Presidential election. We are going to call that "pat" hand and inspect it, spread out flat, face upward [laughter and applause], and we don't intend to be bluffed by any "bob-tailed flush" business. [Renewed laughter and applause.] Don't you imagine that you are going to run off with the game. [Laughter.] We are not as badly scared as we look. [Laughter.] "Stand pat" if you will, but let us have a fair game, play it out to a finish, shake hands like gentlemen when it is over, and we hope to be able to capture the Presidential "pot." [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. VAN VOORHIS. Mr. Chairman, I demand the reading of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio moves that the bill be now read.

The motion was agreed to.

The Clerk read the bill at length.

Mr. VAN VOORHIS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee now rise and report the bill to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. OLMSTED, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 6758, the pension appropriation bill, and had instructed him to report the same back with the recommendation that it do pass.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. VAN VOORHIS, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL EXCHANGE.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was ordered printed and referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith the report of the Commission on International Exchange, constituted under authority of the act of March 3, 1903, in compliance with the request of the Governments of Mexico and China for the cooperation of the United States in an effort to bring about a fixed relationship between the moneys of the gold-standard countries and the present silver-using countries. The attention of Congress is invited to the accompanying report of the Secretary of State, whose request for an appropriation of \$100,000 for the

completion of the work of the Commission in China and other expenditures incidental to the work of the Commission I heartily indorse.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

WHITE HOUSE, December 15, 1903.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. WACHTER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the following titles; when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 1921. An act to carry into effect a convention between the United States and the Republic of Cuba, signed on the 11th day of December, in the year 1902;

H. J. Res. 66. Joint resolution in relation to commuted rations for midshipmen;

H. J. Res. 70. Joint resolution to pay the officers and employees of the Senate and House of Representatives their respective salaries for the month of December, 1903, on the 18th day of said month;

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. WACHTER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had presented this day to the President of the United States for his approval bills and resolutions of the following titles:

H. R. 1921. An act to carry into effect a convention between the United States and the Republic of Cuba, signed on the 11th day of December, in the year 1902;

H. J. Res. 66. Joint resolution in relation to commuted rations for midshipmen; and

H. J. Res. 70. Joint resolution to pay the officers and employees of the Senate and House of Representatives their respective salaries for the month of December, 1903, on the 18th day of said month.

ASSIGNMENT OF SESSION CLERKS.

Mr. HILDEBRANT. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following report from the Committee on Accounts.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Committee on Accounts having considered the question of the designation of the thirteen session clerks to committees at \$6 each per day during the session, provided for in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill for the year ending June 30, 1904, after careful consideration have selected the committees named in the accompanying resolution to be supplied each with a session clerk. The committees named were supplied in like manner in the Fifty-second Congress. Your committee recommends the adoption of the accompanying resolution.

Mr. HILDEBRANT, from the Committee on Accounts, reported the following resolution:

Resolved, That clerks to committees of the House during the session, provided for by the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1904, be, and they are hereby, allowed and assigned for the present Congress to the following committees, namely:

- To the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures, a clerk.
- To the Committee on Education, a clerk.
- To the Committee on Enrolled Bills, a clerk.
- To the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, a clerk.
- To the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands, a clerk.
- To the Committee on Labor, a clerk.
- To the Committee on Militia, a clerk.
- To the Committee on Mines and Mining, a clerk.
- To the Committee on Patents, a clerk.
- To the Committee on Invalid Pensions, a clerk.
- To the Committee on Railways and Canals, a clerk.
- To the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service, a clerk.
- To the Committee on Territories, a clerk.

Resolved, That the pay of the clerks to the committees of the House of Representatives which have been or may be hereafter authorized by the House, who are paid during the session only, shall begin from the time such clerks entered upon the discharge of their duties, which shall be ascertained and evidenced by the certificate of the chairmen of the several committees employing clerks for the session only.

The resolution was agreed to.

COMMITTEE CLERKS.

Mr. HILDEBRANT also, from the Committee on Accounts, reported the following resolution as a substitute for resolutions of the following numbers, referred to the committee: 29, 31, 38, 60, 61, 63, 72, 73, 74, 87, 89, 93, 94, and 98:

1. *Resolved*, That the chairman of the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions is hereby authorized to appoint a clerk to said committee for the sessions of the Fifty-eighth Congress, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, at the rate of \$3 per day.

2. *Resolved*, That the chairman of the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads is hereby authorized to appoint an assistant clerk to said committee, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House until otherwise provided, at the rate of \$1.400 per annum.

3. *Resolved*, That the chairmen of the following-named committees are hereby authorized to appoint session clerks to such committees to serve during the session of the Fifty-eighth Congress, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, at the rate of \$6 per day each, to wit: Census, Indian Affairs, Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Invalid Pensions, Pacific Railroads, and Private Land Claims.

4. *Resolved*, That the chairman of the Committee on Invalid Pensions is hereby authorized to appoint a stenographer for said committee during the Fifty-eighth Congress, at a salary of \$3 per day, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

5. *Resolved*, That the chairman of the Committee on Enrolled Bills is hereby authorized to appoint a janitor to said committee and to the engrossing room of the House, at the rate of \$90 per month, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, until otherwise provided for by law, during the present Congress.

6. *Resolved*, That the chairmen of the following-named committees are hereby authorized to appoint janitors to such committees to serve during the Fifty-eighth Congress, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House at the rate of \$90 per month each, to wit: Education, and Levees and Improvements of the Mississippi River. Also, that the Doorkeeper of the House is hereby authorized to appoint four janitors to serve during the Fifty-eighth Congress, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House at the rate of \$90 per month. It shall be the duty of said four janitors to have the care of the following-named committee rooms, viz: Alcoholic Liquor Traffic, Election of President and Vice-President and Representatives in Congress, Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture, Expenditures in the Department of Justice, Expenditures in the Interior Department, Expenditures in the Navy Department, Expenditures in the Post-Office Department, Expenditures in the State Department, Expenditures in the Treasury Department, Expenditures in the War Department, Expenditures on Public Buildings, Mileage, Ventilation, and Acoustics. The Doorkeeper of the House is authorized to apportion among the four janitors the foregoing committee rooms and to see that they are carefully cared for during the sessions of the House.

7. *Resolved*, That the Clerk of the House of Representatives is hereby authorized to pay to the widow of Samuel H. Decker, late a messenger on the soldiers' roll of the House of Representatives, a sum equal to six months' salary and funeral expenses not exceeding \$250, to be paid from the contingent fund of the House.

8. *Resolved*, That the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to appoint a messenger to the committee for the sessions of the Fifty-eighth Congress, at a salary of \$90 per month, to be paid from the contingent fund of the House until otherwise provided for by law.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. If I may put a question to the chairman of the committee, I should like to know why it is necessary to have a janitor and a clerk for one of the committees of which I happen to be a member—the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Justice. As I understand, there has not been a bill before that committee in years, and I know it has not met during the two years I have been a member. I can not see why we should spend money for these officers for that committee.

Mr. HILDEBRANT. My understanding is that the gentleman's committee has no clerk provided for it; and it is provided with only a fraction of a man for janitor; in other words, one janitor is provided to look after three or four committee rooms.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Why do we need a committee room?

Mr. HILDEBRANT. The gentleman is a member of that committee and he ought to be able to answer the question. Why does not the committee meet?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Because the chairman never calls us together; because there are no bills referred to us. I will ask the gentleman why some Member does not present a bill for us to act on? Why is it necessary for committees such as ours, having no business, to have rooms and clerks and janitors?

Mr. BARTLETT. The gentleman from Texas is mistaken in supposing that this resolution provides a janitor for his committee room. The resolution provides for four janitors, whose business it will be to take charge of thirteen committee rooms—not one janitor for each room.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. As I understood, our room is mentioned separately; and I suppose the same is true of the rooms of other committees of the same class.

Mr. BARTLETT. The resolution does not provide a janitor for each room, but four janitors for thirteen rooms.

The resolution was agreed to.

CLERKS FOR CHAIRMEN OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. HILDEBRANT, from the Committee on Accounts, reported also the following resolution, which was read:

Resolved, That Members of the House of Representatives who are chairmen of committees entitled to annual clerks shall be entitled to the same allowance for clerk hire during the sessions of Congress as is authorized by law to other Members of the House who are not chairmen of committees, and the Clerk of the House is hereby directed to make payment hereunder, out of the contingent fund of the House, in the manner provided in the joint resolution approved March 3, 1893, until provision is made in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act, or otherwise by law, to carry out the purposes of this resolution.

The report of the committee states that the resolution is in the exact language of that adopted by the House on January 15, 1902, making the same provision for clerk hire in the present Congress as was paid to Members of the Fifty-seventh Congress.

The resolution was adopted.

ASSISTANT STENOGRAPHERS TO COMMITTEES.

Mr. HILDEBRANT also, from the Committee on Accounts, reported back with an amendment the following resolution:

Resolved, That the Speaker of the House is hereby authorized to appoint an assistant stenographer to committees at the rate of \$5,000 per annum, to be paid from the contingent fund of the House until otherwise provided for by law.

The amendment reported by the committee was read, as follows:

In line 3 strike out "\$5,000" and insert "\$3,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was adopted.

BOOKS FOR JUDICIARY COMMITTEE.

Mr. HILDEBRANT also, from the Committee on Accounts, reported as a substitute for House resolution 93 the following:

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House of Representatives is hereby authorized to furnish the Committee on the Judiciary with the following works and books, namely: Three sets of United States Compiled Statutes and Supplement, published by the West Publishing Company, of St. Paul, Minn.; three

sets of United States Compiled Statutes and Supplement, published by the Lawyers' Cooperative Publishing Company, of Rochester, N. Y.; and Rose's Notes (thirteen volumes) of United States Reports; and Rose's Digest (three volumes) United States Reports, and Russell and Winslow's Syllabus-Digest of the United States Supreme Court Reports, to be paid for from the contingent fund of the House.

The substitute reported by way of amendment was agreed to, and the resolution as amended was adopted.

On motion of Mr. HILDEBRANT, a motion to reconsider the votes by which the several resolutions were passed was laid upon the table.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

By unanimous consent, reference of the bill (H. R. 7025) providing for a superintendent of the fire department of the District of Columbia was changed from the Committee on the District of Columbia to the Committee on Appropriations.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. SCOTT, for the remainder of the week, on account of important business.

LEAVE TO PRINT.

Mr. VAN VOORHIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general leave to print on the pension appropriation bill be granted for five days.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I would like to supplement that request by asking also that gentlemen who have spoken be granted leave to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Ohio accept the suggestion of the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. VAN VOORHIS. I do.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio, as supplemented by the gentleman from Mississippi? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Then, on motion of Mr. PAYNE (at 3 o'clock and 31 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of Commerce and Labor submitting an estimate of appropriation for the establishment of a light-vessel on Hedge Fence Shoal, at the entrance of Vineyard Sound—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the chief of the supply division giving the proceeds of sale of useless papers—to the Committee on Printing, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Supervising Architect submitting an estimate of appropriation for repairs of Kenduskeag bridge at Bangor—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of State submitting a recommendation that the Government give its adhesion to the International Railway Congress—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Auditor for the State and other Departments submitting an estimate of appropriations for certain clerks—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. SULZER, from the Committee on Patents, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 5059) to afford protection to exhibitors of foreign literary, artistic, or musical works at the Louisiana Purchase Exposition, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 12); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of bills of the following titles; which were thereupon referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 5654) removing charge of desertion against John

Benson, late seaman on the United States steamship *Iroquois*—Committee on Military Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (H. R. 5655) to correct the military record of John Barrow—Committee on Military Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (H. R. 6155) granting a pension to Henry Cook—Committee on Military Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DIXON: A bill (H. R. 8133) to ratify and amend an agreement with the Indians of the Crow Reservation, in Montana, and making appropriations to carry the same into effect—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: A bill (H. R. 8134) limiting the hours of daily service of laborers and mechanics employed upon work done for the United States, or for any Territory, or for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. LACEY: A bill (H. R. 8135) for the protection of wild animals, birds, and fish in the forest reserves of the United States—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: A bill (H. R. 8136) to limit the meaning of the word "conspiracy" and the use of "restraining orders and injunctions" in certain cases—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STAFFORD: A bill (H. R. 8137) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Waukesha, in the State of Wisconsin—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SMITH of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 8138) to establish a United States court at Madill, in the Indian Territory—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KINKAID: A bill (H. R. 8139) to restore to homesteaders on the Fort Randall Military Reservation their homestead rights—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. ALLEN: A bill (H. R. 8140) for the extension of Twenty-fourth street northeast, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PATTERSON of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 8141) authorizing the Secretary of War to procure medals for the Massachusetts and Pennsylvania soldiers whose organizations were the first to tender their services and the first who arrived in Washington in response to President Lincoln's call, April 15, 1861, for 75,000 volunteers, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIAMSON: A bill (H. R. 8142) entitling veterans of Indian wars to admission to Soldiers' Homes in the United States on the same terms as veterans of the civil war—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8143) to amend an act entitled "An act authorizing the citizens of Colorado, Nevada, and the Territories to fell timber," and so forth, approved June 3, 1878—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8144) to amend an act entitled "An act authorizing the citizens of Colorado, Nevada, and the Territories to fell and remove timber on the public domain," and so forth—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. AIKEN: A bill (H. R. 8145) to increase the compensation of carriers on rural free-delivery mail routes—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. ZENOR: A bill (H. R. 8146) for the relief of the non-enlisted officers and members of the crews of the Mississippi Ram Fleet and Marine Brigade—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHERMAN (by request): A bill (H. R. 8147) for the relief of the Stockbridge and Munsee tribe of Indians of the State of Wisconsin—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BOWERS: A bill (H. R. 8148) for improvement of Pascagoula River and Horn Island Harbor—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8149) for continuing improvement of the upper Pascagoula, Leaf, and Chickasawha rivers—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8150) for the improvement of Pearl River, Mississippi—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. BARTLETT: A bill (H. R. 8151) to provide for the erection of a public building in the city of Milledgeville, Ga.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. FREDERICK LANDIS: A bill (H. R. 8152) for the relief of the Miami Indians of Indiana—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. KEHOE: A bill (H. R. 8153) for the erection of a public building at Cynthiana, Ky.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. McGUIRE: A bill (H. R. 8154) to open to settlement the grazing lands set apart for the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Indians in Comanche County, Oklahoma Territory—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8155) to amend an act entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to supplement existing laws relating to the disposition of lands, and so forth, approved March 3, 1901,'" approved June 13, 1902—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: A bill (H. R. 8156) providing for notice before issuance of certain orders and writs by the courts and judges of the United States courts—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARDWICK: A bill (H. R. 8157) to provide for the erection of a public building in the town of Sparta, Ga.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8158) to provide for the erection of a public building in the city of Sandersville, Ga.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8159) to provide for the erection of a public building in the town of Thomson, Ga.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 8160) to declare a portion of the Minnesota River, in the State of Minnesota, not navigable, and authorizing the construction of bridges thereon—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GOULDEN: A concurrent resolution (H. C. Res. 25) requiring the Secretary of War to furnish Senators, Representatives, and Delegates of the Fifty-eighth Congress one set of the Official Records of the Rebellion—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. GRIFFITH: Memorial of the legislature of Indiana, in favor of granting a pension to all soldiers of the civil war—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, memorial of the legislature of Indiana, in favor of the improvement of the Ohio River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 8161) granting a pension to James D. Gay—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BANKHEAD: A bill (H. R. 8162) for the relief of John W. White, of Tuscaloosa County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BARTLETT: A bill (H. R. 8163) granting a pension to Nelson Allen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: A bill (H. R. 8164) granting a pension to William Marshall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BATES: A bill (H. R. 8165) granting a pension to John O'Hagan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BOWERSOCK: A bill (H. R. 8166) granting an increase of pension to Martha A. Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROWN of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 8167) granting a pension to Josiah P. Sanders—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROWN of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 8168) granting a pension to Emma J. Shepler—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BROWNLOW: A bill (H. R. 8169) for the relief of George Killeen—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BURNETT: A bill (H. R. 8170) granting a pension to Thomas K. C. Gibson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLARK: A bill (H. R. 8171) granting a pension to Miligan Ewing—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8172) granting a pension to Cordelia Rodgers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8173) granting an increase of pension to Anna Waters—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8174) granting a pension to Marion Skinner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8175) removing the charge of desertion from the record of Timothy O'Leary—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8176) for the relief of the heirs of William H. Finch—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DRESSER: A bill (H. R. 8177) for the relief of J. M. Bloom—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8178) appropriating money to pay William Tucker for services and expenses as acting captain and drillmaster of Company D, One hundred and fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteers—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8179) granting an increase of pension to David L. Miller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8180) granting an increase of pension to William Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8181) granting a pension to Alice N. Payne—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8182) granting a pension to Louisa D. Miller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8183) granting a pension to Daniel Robb—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DE ARMOND: A bill (H. R. 8184) granting an increase of pension to Vernon L. Johnson—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DUNWELL: A bill (H. R. 8185) granting a pension to Herman Lemmerman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8186) for the relief of Robert D. Benedict—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8187) granting an increase of pension to George Jeffrey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DWIGHT: A bill (H. R. 8188) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Aldrich—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 8189) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin A. Sawyer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts (by request): A bill (H. R. 8190) for the relief of heirs of Edmund Bell, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GILBERT: A bill (H. R. 8191) granting an increase of pension to James K. Parker—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GRIFFITH: A bill (H. R. 8192) granting a pension to Samuel C. Gildersleeve—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HEPBURN: A bill (H. R. 8193) granting an increase of pension to Almerin Peck—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8194) granting a pension to Nancy L. Stone—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HITT: A bill (H. R. 8195) granting an increase of pension to Joseph F. Allison—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8196) to amend the military record of Peter Tigan—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOLLIDAY: A bill (H. R. 8197) granting an increase of pension to Jeremiah Skelton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8198) granting an increase of pension to Jeremiah R. Tryon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8199) granting an increase of pension to Absalom E. Gentry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8200) granting an increase of pension to Charles Wehr—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8201) granting an increase of pension to George W. Florye—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8202) granting an increase of pension to Griffin Gray—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8203) granting a pension to James M. Hempill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOUSTON: A bill (H. R. 8204) for the relief of James H. Reed for use and occupation of land by the Light-House Establishment for range light as an aid to navigation—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JAMES: A bill (H. R. 8205) for the relief of S. Hodge—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8206) for the relief of the estate of Timothy Burgess, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LAFEAN: A bill (H. R. 8207) granting an increase of pension to Charles Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FREDERICK LANDIS: A bill (H. R. 8208) granting a pension to Burleigh C. D. Read—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8209) granting a pension to Paul H. Bahr—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8210) granting a pension to Susan E. Weaver—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8211) for the relief of the bondsmen of Isaiah W. Eurit, late postmaster at Macy, Ind.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8212) granting an increase of pension to John Lazro—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8213) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Murray—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LANNING: A bill (H. R. 8214) granting a pension to Lewis R. Runkle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LESTER: A bill (H. R. 8215) granting a pension to Thomas Burney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8216) granting a pension to David Houston—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8217) granting an increase of pension to Caroline M. Bird—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LIVINGSTON: A bill (H. R. 8218) granting an increase of pension to John J. Martin—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LOUD: A bill (H. R. 8219) granting an increase of pension to William H. Broadwell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8220) granting an increase of pension to Edward B. Nugent—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MACON: A bill (H. R. 8221) for the relief of Robert Gordon, administrator of estate of Jamison W. Rice, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MAYNARD: A bill (H. R. 8222) for the relief of the widow of Joseph Culley—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MOON of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 8223) granting a pension to John J. MacEntee—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8224) for the relief of John W. Dampman—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8225) granting a pension to Hattie E. Fosse—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8226) granting a pension to Elizabeth Burdison—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PADGETT: A bill (H. R. 8227) granting a pension to Lucius E. Polk—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PEARRE: A bill (H. R. 8228) for the relief of Richard T. Gott, administrator of Thomas N. Gott, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8229) for the relief of Nathan Shaw—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8230) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Samuel A. Motter—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PORTER: A bill (H. R. 8231) granting an increase of pension to John Gangwisch—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RIDER: A bill (H. R. 8232) granting an increase of pension to John D. Terry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBERTS: A bill (H. R. 8233) granting a pension to Sarah E. Merritt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8234) granting a pension to Mary A. Armstrong—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8235) granting a pension to John L. Rumery—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8236) granting a pension to Catherine B. Marshall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8237) granting a pension to Ellen J. Tuttle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8238) granting an increase of pension to Eli Veazie—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8239) granting a pension to Sarah E. Holbrook—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8240) granting an increase of pension to Thomas F. Rowley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8241) granting an increase of pension to Cyrus Conduit—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8242) granting an increase of pension to Asa T. Tarbox—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8243) granting an increase of pension to Samuel F. Oliver—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8244) granting an increase of pension to George W. Cook—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8245) granting an increase of pension to Stephen Ellis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8246) granting an increase of pension to George F. Hubbard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8247) granting an increase of pension to Mary V. Wentworth—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8248) granting an increase of pension to George W. Vaughn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8249) granting an increase of pension to Oliver Farrington—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8250) to amend the records on file at the War Department—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8251) to amend the military record of Henry W. Dunbrack—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8252) for the relief of Ebenezer S. Bigelow—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHAFROTH: A bill (H. R. 8253) granting a pension to Sara D. Bereman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8254) granting a pension to S. Effie Parkhill and the minor heirs of Clayton Parkhill—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8255) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Creed—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8256) granting an increase of pension to Harry M. de Hart—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8257) granting an increase of pension to John M. Berkey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8258) granting an increase of pension to Charles Christy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8259) granting an increase of pension to Mary P. Scovel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8260) granting an increase of pension to Orlando J. Hopkins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8261) granting an increase of pension to Henry H. Geiger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8262) granting an increase of pension to Henry Walters—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8263) for the relief of James Inman—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8264) for the relief of George G. Wortman—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8265) granting a pension to Madison M. Burnett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SKILES: A bill (H. R. 8266) granting a pension to Maranda Russ—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8267) granting a pension to Walter R. Behr—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 8268) granting a pension to Sidney D. Mackey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH: A bill (H. R. 8269) to correct the military record of Capt. Daniel H. Powers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8270) granting a pension to Samuel Hooper—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 8271) granting an increase of pension to Franklin Eckenrode—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STAFFORD: A bill (H. R. 8272) granting an increase of pension to Stephen Elliott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STERLING: A bill (H. R. 8273) granting an increase of pension to Lydia A. McNier—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8274) granting an increase of pension to Julia A. Moore—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SULLIVAN of New York: A bill (H. R. 8275) granting an increase of pension to William McBride—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8276) for the relief of Charles Uerkvitz—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina: A bill (H. R. 8277) for the relief of the heirs of Elijah D. Guthrie—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TAYLOR: A bill (H. R. 8278) granting an increase of pension to John C. Cavanaugh—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TOWNSEND: A bill (H. R. 8279) granting a pension to Mary E. Roberts—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WACHTER: A bill (H. R. 8280) granting an increase of pension to James A. Morrison—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8281) for the relief of Sarah E. Jenkins—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WADE: A bill (H. R. 8282) granting an increase of pension to Chauncey R. Dickinson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8283) granting an increase of pension to Henry Herkes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8284) granting an increase of pension to Samuel G. Woods—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8285) granting an increase of pension to W. S. Peck—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8286) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin Owen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8287) granting a pension to Abram T. Carney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8288) granting a pension to Andrew J. Speed—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8289) granting a pension to Milton Wintersteen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8290) for the relief of George Humphrey—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 8291) for the relief of James K. Hamblen, of Madison County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8292) for the relief of Mrs. M. M. Champion—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8293) for the relief of the estate of James P. Smith—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8294) for the relief of J. B. Hall, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8295) for the relief of the estate of Henry E. Windley—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8296) for the relief of the estate of Evan Cook, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8297) for the relief of the estate of James Roach, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8298) for the relief of the estate of Wirt Adams—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8299) for the relief of Abner P. Bush, of Hinds County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8300) for the relief of the estate of W. T. Collins, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8301) for the relief of the estate of Thomas S. Maben, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8302) for the relief of the estate of James S. Winters, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8303) for the relief of the estate of Wesley Crisler, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8304) for the relief of Charlotte Spears—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8305) for the relief of Mary Ann Jackson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8306) for the relief of L. A. Whitehead—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8307) for the relief of J. E. Whittington—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8308) for the relief of the estate of Jesse Mabry, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8309) for the relief of Mattie J. and W. P. Horn, heirs of Preston A. Horn—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8310) for the relief of the estate of William McBride, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 8311) granting an increase of pension to Walter Fobar—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8312) granting an increase of pension to William Clark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8313) granting an increase of pension to A. H. Noble—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8314) granting an increase of pension to John C. Crawford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8315) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of George A. Crisel—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VAN VOORHIS: A bill (H. R. 8316) granting an increase of pension to James W. Swords—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8317) granting an increase of pension to Willis D. Reed—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8318) granting an increase of pension to William H. Vermillion—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROWN of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 8319) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John T. Booth—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. BARTHOLOMEW: Letters from St. Louis Cooperage Company, Larkin & Scheffer Chemical Company, the Parker-Russell Mining and Manufacturing Company, Anthony Ittner Brick Company, and the Broderick & Bascom Rope Company, protesting against passage of an eight-hour law—to the Committee on Labor.

Also, letters from Hamilton Brown Shoe Company, Gauss-Langenberg Hat Company, and the Brown Shoe Company against passage of a parcels-post bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. BRICK: Petition of James Nelson and 10 other Irish-American citizens of South Bend, Ind., urging the erection of a monument to Capt. John Barry—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. BROWN of Pennsylvania: Resolution of the board of directors of the Grain and Flour Exchange of Pittsburg, Pa., favoring enlargement of power of the Interstate Commerce Commission—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolution of the Pennsylvania State Forestry Reservation Commission, favoring the preservation of the big trees of California—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BURNETT: Paper to accompany bill granting pension to Thomas K. C. Gibson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: Resolution of the Association of Commissioners of the Levee Drainage Districts, relative to the im-

provement of the upper Mississippi River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of San Miguel Improvement Club, favoring Nacimientto ranch as a military camp—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CANNON: Petition of the Philadelphia Quartette Club and 15 similar clubs of German-Americans, protesting against legislation for subjecting articles of interstate commerce to local sumptuary laws—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of residents of Danville, Ill., against the repeal of the law abolishing the army canteen—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CASSINGHAM: Papers to accompany bill H. R. 892, granting an increase of pension to Abram H. Hunt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CUSHMAN: Memorial of citizens of the State of Washington and Alaska, urging Government appropriation for the construction of a submarine telegraph cable from Sitka to Valdez—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota: Resolutions of Dudley P. Chase Post, No. 22, Grand Army of the Republic, Minneapolis, Department of Minnesota; J. K. Mertz Post, No. 144, Grand Army of the Republic, New Auburn, Department of Minnesota; John Ball Post, Grand Army of the Republic, Winona, Department of Minnesota; and Custer Post, No. 44, Grand Army of the Republic, Rochester, Department of Minnesota, favoring passage of a service-pension law—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DENNY: Resolution of the Baltimore Chamber of Commerce, relative to increasing depth of main ship channel—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. DUNWELL: Paper to accompany claim of Laura P. Jones—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts: Paper to accompany bill to increase pension of Benjamin A. Sawyer—to Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRIFFITH: Paper to accompany bill granting a pension to Samuel C. Gildersleeve—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAY: Papers to accompany claim of William Trenton—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HINSHAW: Resolution of Staire Post, No. 201, Grand Army of the Republic, of Plymouth, Department of Nebraska, favoring passage of a service-pension law—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HITT: Paper to accompany bill for the relief of Peter Tigan—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, paper to accompany bill granting a pension to Luella Swartbout—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petitions of John T. La Forge, of Rockford, Ill.; H. W. Heckman, of Dixon, Ill., and W. G. Squier and 26 others, of Rockford, Ill., against sale of liquors in Soldiers' Homes and Government buildings—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN: Resolution relating to the spread of the Mexican boll weevil—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LAFEAN: Papers to accompany bill granting an increase of pension to Charles Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota: Paper to accompany bill H. R. 7447, to pension William Bailey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MACON: Papers to accompany claim of Robert Gordon, administrator—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama: Paper to accompany bill H. R. 2403, for the relief of M. H. Carr—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ROBB: Petition of citizens of Bollinger County, Mo., against sale of liquors in Soldiers' Homes and Government buildings—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. SPALDING: Resolution of J. J. Crittenden Post, No. 31, Grand Army of the Republic, of Minnewaukan, N. Dak., favoring passage of a service-pension law—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: Petition of citizens of Hillsboro, N. Mex., favoring passage of a service-pension law—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SULLIVAN of New York: Resolution of the Grain Dealers' National Convention, favoring enlargement of power of the Interstate Commerce Commission—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, paper relative to the improvement of the Harlem River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, paper to accompany claim of Charles Merkvitz—to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina: Papers to accompany bill for the relief of the heirs of Elijah D. Guthrie—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. VAN VOORHIS: Papers to accompany bill to increase pension of Willis D. Reed—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill to pension William H. Vermilion, and papers to accompany bill to pension James W. Swords—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WACHTER: Resolution of the Baltimore Chamber of Commerce relative to deepening main ship channel—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, paper to accompany bill granting increase of pension to James A. Morrison—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for the relief of Sarah E. Jenkins—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois: Paper to accompany bill to increase pension of William Clark—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill granting increase of pension to A. H. Noble—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of E. A. Martin and others, of Fairfield, Ill., against passage of parcels-post bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, December 18, 1903.

Prayer by Rev. F. J. PRETTYMAN, of the city of Washington.

NAMING A PRESIDING OFFICER.

Mr. PERKINS (at the Vice-President's desk) directed the Secretary to read the following communication:

PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE UNITED STATES SENATE,
December 18, 1903.

To the honorable Senate of the United States:

I hereby appoint GEORGE C. PERKINS, Senator from California, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

WM. P. FRYE,
President pro tempore.

Thereupon Mr. PERKINS took the chair as Presiding Officer, and directed the Secretary to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. BURROWS, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

REPORT OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERKINS in the chair) laid before the Senate the seventeenth annual report of the Interstate Commerce Commission; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

AGRICULTURAL COLLEGES.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report of the disbursements for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1904, made in the States and Territories under the provisions of an act to apply a portion of the public lands to the more complete endowment and support of the colleges for the benefit of agricultural and mechanical arts, etc.; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Public Lands, and ordered to be printed.

PROPOSED GRAVING DOCK.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 19th ultimo, certain information relative to the Government constructing and owning a graving dock on the Gulf of Mexico; which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 6758) making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1905, and for other purposes; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. BARD presented a petition of the congregation of the First Presbyterian Church of Fresno, Cal., and a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Watsonville, Cal., praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. ANKENY presented a petition of sundry citizens of the United States interested in the welfare of Alaska, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the extension of the Alaska cable from Valdes to Dutch Harbor, on the coast of the Territory of Alaska; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. GIBSON (for Mr. CLARK of Montana) presented a petition of sundry citizens of Ravalli County, Mont., praying for the enactment of legislation to validate the title of certain lands in that locality; which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. GALLINGER presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Ashland, N. H., praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. DOLLIVER presented a petition of the congregation of the Presbyterian Church of Crawfordville, Iowa, and a petition of the Conversational Club, of Des Moines, Iowa, praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I present a petition in reference to the Isle of Pines treaty, which I ask may lie on the table, as that treaty is pending.

Mr. LODGE. I make the point of order that the petition is executive business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will lie on the table.

Mr. LODGE. I know, but ought it not to be presented in executive session?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair thinks the Senator from Massachusetts is correct. Therefore the Senator from Iowa will please retain the petition and present it in executive session.

Mr. BATE presented petitions of the Woman's Missionary Society, the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church, the Ladies' Aid Society, the congregation of the Central Presbyterian Church, the Woman's Missionary Society of the Baptist Church, the Wednesday Afternoon Club, and the Woman's Missionary Society of the Presbyterian Church, all of McMinnville, in the State of Tennessee, praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. WETMORE presented a petition of the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Middletown, R. I., praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. LONG presented a petition of Sherman Post, No. 30, Department of Kansas, Grand Army of the Republic, of Ness City, Kans., praying for the enactment of a service-pension law; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented petitions of the Woman's Missionary Society of Columbus, of the Ladies' Reading Circle of Olathe, of sundry citizens of Conway Springs, and of the congregation of the United Presbyterian Church of Walton, all in the State of Kansas, praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

He also presented the affidavit of Dr. J. B. Draper, of Fort Dodge, Kans., to accompany the bill (S. 1807) granting an increase of pension to James Gray; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented the petition of Florence M. Metz, of East Hutchinson, Kans., to accompany the bill (S. 2466) granting an increase of pension to Florence M. Metz; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented sundry papers to accompany the bill (S. 1803) granting an increase of pension to John M. Morgan; which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. WETMORE, from the Committee on the Library, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1634) for the erection of a statue to the memory of Gen. James Miller at Peterboro, N. H., reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. WARREN, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2696) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Treasury to pay John F. Weston the sum of \$241.60, etc., reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the joint resolution (S. R. 8) authorizing the Secretary of War to negotiate with John T. Dolan, of Portland, Oreg., for purchase of original manuscript copy of Order Book of Gen. Arthur St. Clair, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

FRENCH COMBATANTS IN REVOLUTIONARY WAR.

Mr. PLATT of New York, from the Committee on Printing, reported a resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the usual number of the book recently published and issued by the French Government entitled "Combattants Français de la Guerre Américaine, 1778-1783," be printed for the use of the Senate, with the accompanying illustrations.